A 000 088 053 4
UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES

LUTTERWORTH LECTURES

CHRISTIANITY

AND

LANGUAGE

BY

VARIOUS AUTHORS

WITH A

FOREWORD AND INTRODUCTION

BY

LORD BRAYE

RUGBY
A. E. TREEN
1913

00 ENG
501
0809

FOREWORD.

More than once, approaching on a mild and misty morn the little town of Lutterworth, I have seen the old Church tower, dim in the winter's dawn, a tower on which once stood a spire forty-seven feet in height, a landmark for the three counties of Leicester, Warwick, and Northampton. The spire was blown down in the Great Storm of 1703, fateful year, which saw the birth of John Wesley, who drew away half England from Anglicanism. Here in this peaceful plain, a lawn of grass unequalled in the world, where grow the elm, the oak, and the ash, stands the old Church still. There spreads the ash, which the Danes adored for the beauty it unfolds, and after which they named so many of the surrounding villages "Ashby," or "the town of the ash." Now the ancient faith has withered, if not the leafy adornment of the plain; the county knows the dominion of the Faith no more. From my boyish note-book, now yellow with age, the lines recur to me :—

How many a shrine where Silence keeps
  Her thankless watch in place of prayer,
Where each returning day-spring weeps
  To find no Pure Oblation there;
And when the westering sun has left
  The porch 'midst dim-drawn clouds to glide,
He bears no note from naves bereft
  Of Vespers, due at eventide.

But, winding round the lea begins to shine the little river Swift, which, history tells us, carried the incinerated bones of Wicklif, the Arch-Socialist, far away to the Severn and to the sea. The Bishop of Lincoln journeyed hither, and in obedience to the decree of the Council of Constance and the injunctions of Martin V.

501809

presided over the mournful ceremony, the mere narration of which shocks the ears of later generations. But why so? Let us reflect what animated such public displays of condemnation. The men who did these things *believed*. To them one religion was not as good as another, any more than to millions who preceded them in the world's annals, who laid down their lives to establish precisely this truth, that the gospel of Indifferentism to things divine, preached in this twentieth century of our era, is not the true Gospel. Furthermore, their underlying principle was sound, for their logic was inexorable when it stood for the fact that translation is transmutation or change; that one idea is not the same when expressed in different languages, that tongues of human races represent concepts of different form, and that in changing the racial expressions you change the fundamental root-idea. The science of language was vindicated on the day when the ashes of Wicklif were cast into the little stream. Was not the Word of the Eternal delivered to man in the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin? Were not the tongues affixed to the Cross the manifestation of the condescension of God, of the flower of mental culture, and of the strength of inflexible discipline and law? This Trinity of the thought-breath of the three most wondrous of the races of man is a dim reflection of the Triune Creator, Who willed these and no other languages to be the vehicle of His revealed Word. But human error is perpetually setting up itself against the Divine will. There was to come the day of the Reformers, who, seizing Wicklif's idea, spread the doctrine that the words of Scripture must be vulgarised and brought home to the common people, and that the Word thus transmuted and altered was to be the sole Rule of faith, to the exclusion of the living Voice of the Apostolic See. But how did their new doctrine work? Ideas enshrined in the English of Chaucer are no longer intelligible to the English of to-day. Words which in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin contain the fulness of Revelation become void of meaning, when for them are substituted the ever-shifting expressions of our constantly changing vernacular. Every time Scripture is re-translated the language which enshrines it must be modernised and brought up-to-date if it is to have

any circulation. And, even then, success recedes as the translator advances, and eludes his grasp. The work may be praiseworthy, nay a triumph of literature. But the fulness of Divine grace is not there ; for modern language has no words to set it forth. All tongues, save the Three, are incapable of bearing the burden of the Voice from on High. But the Latin Vulgate (the critic will suggest,) is a mere translation, and a faulty one, therefore no more *authentic* than any other—to which I rejoin that, although there may be, and are, thousands of textual obscurities and conjectural departures from the original (*which no longer is extant, certainly as to the Old Testament, and even also as to the New Testament ; for, for all we know, to-morrow there may be discovered something older still than the Codex Sinaiticus*), nevertheless, the Vulgate (not necessarily the Clementine or any other particular issue)—the Vulgate, as far as all its editions agree—is absolutely free from false doctrine, and stamped by the Church in the Council of Trent as the Authentic, *i.e.*, true Scripture. All vernacular translations are liable to error in doctrine, and the Church has never declared any one of them to be authentic. To paraphrase, interpret, expound, illustrate, under Apostolic direction (that is, under the ægis of Rome) is well ; but to invest the translated text with the authority of the Inspired Original is ambition doomed to failure. And on this ambition waits the failure of Protestantism, which is a sin against the great science, the science of language. May it not be said that it is language which tutors and moulds thought, not thought language ? St. Paul announces that it was in Hebrew that Our Lord spoke to him from heaven and St. Luke records the stupendous fact. We know from Our Lord Himself that man is to live by every word coming forth from the mouth of God. Is any word, then, to be diluted, altered, perverted by translation ? In Hebrew what distinction is there between *word* and *thing?* So, too, the Evangelist writes in Greek that the Angel said : " No *word* shall be impossible with God," that is, no *thing*. Again, His Words are imperishable. *Verba Mea non præteribunt.* The vehicle of those words was not any European vernacular, nor even the many Turanian tongues of the vast Asiatic region—nay, nor a

dialect of one of those innumerable tribes whom we in our Pharisaical "superior wisdom" term savage peoples, but the Three Languages which in the fulness of time were ripened to serve the Divine Purpose.

The little Swift shines more brightly and more clearly mirrors the sky, the image of the last star is no longer on the narrow flood, and the smoke rising from distant roofs indicates the beginning of work. Though the scene has changed at the advent of the cold, bare day, the misty pageant faded, the historic picture gone, the figures casting the ashes into the water all dissolved from view, one idea remains and has taken up a dominion in my mind—to invite the learned to hold forth on the theme which the memories of the spot suggest, and to indite their discourse as "the Lutterworth Lectures."

INTRODUCTION.

Q. Quote Virgil's lines written in the life-time of St. Joseph, now Patron of the Catholic Church, then a poor artisan in a despised village of the most despised people in the Roman Empire, lines which seem at once a prophecy and a description of the Greatness of Catholicism.

A.

> Urbem, quam dicunt Romam, Melibœe, putavi
> Stultus ego huic nostræ similem, quo sæpe solemus
> Pastores ovium teneros depellere fœtus.
> Sic canibus catulos similes, sic matribus hædos
> Noram: sic parvis componere magna solebam.
> Verum hæc tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes,
> Quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi.

Q. Which mean?

A. That the Greatness of Rome is not understood by the provincial mind. So too, to-day, the greatness of Rome the spiritual, is past the comprehension of those who dwell on parochial aims exclusively. We are always prone to forget the illimitable in the limits of little environment. This is the reducing of the Church Universal into the chapel in the street. Human nature is so prone to regard the Holy Catholic Church as the Holy Catholic Chapel. *Sursum corda* is a difficult athletic of the soul. After centuries

of repression the Church here in England emerged into liberty. She was very small, very weak, but in the dazzle of the sun she knew it not. Men, judging by her numbers only, classed and do class her among the powerless sects. Few are her children. Very few are we, statistics have not been given. Vivid persecution has given way to tolerance.

Q. Is it an error to suppose such mildness and indifference to be a sign of a drawing near to the Faith?

A. Yes. The two are often and easily confounded.

Q. If by statistics it could be proved that the number of Catholics in proportion to the population is greater now than at any previous epoch since 1559, would it follow that the Church was making sensible progress?

A. If the statistics could show a large and ever increasing number (although a minority) of Catholics it would be right to infer progress —but it is admitted on all sides that no large minority is existent; we must try to find out whether prejudice against the Faith has so far diminished as to allow us to anticipate a large number of conversions—large enough to influence the destinies of the nation. But this does not appear to be the case. The middle

classes (to use a common expession) are untouched by any sympathy with the Church; even if their prejudice is less their distance from the faith is as great as ever. We should expect to find a vast change in the upper and educated classes—there has been, indeed, a very large number of conversions—but individual conversions have not influenced the nation at large.

Q. Is the Royal Accession Oath an evidence that the Catholic body has but little influence in the country?

A. Undoubtedly eight monarchs in succession would not have been able, publicly and with the utmost solemnity, to make such a pronounced Declaration had their Catholic subjects been in any sense influential. They would not have ventured to do so.

Q. Is the modern mind of England wholly opposed to Catholic dogma?

A. Wholly in the vast body of the middle classes and among the uneducated. The higher classes (so called) still retain an undefined but real apprehension of the Faith.

Q. What has been the chief cause of this opposition to the Faith?

A. Misapprehension and misty ignorance which have prevailed in this land near 400

years. The Catholic religion in the English mind is one thing and in reality quite another.

Q. State the chief causes of this misty ignorance.

A. The inability on the part of Catholics to command a hearing to explain their creed on the one hand—and on the other hand the assumption among the many that our creed is not worth a hearing.

Q. Has the Church in England always made use of the best means to command a hearing?

A. It would appear that she has lost many and very valuable opportunities.

Q. Were the Catholics in England of old sufficiently united to command a force of influence?

A. No—they were ever in disunion.

Q. From Elizabethan times?

A. Yes, from the earliest period since the Change of religion their method and their aim were divided. History presents no picture of disunion in faith, but much disunion as to the best means of re-establishing it. There was a disastrous difference of opinion in what is known as the Archpriest controversy, a division and sub-division of the apparatus of education, a deplorable contention as to

the conditions to be made to gain Emancipation, bordering on schism, and, finally, divergence of idea whether Catholic youth should or should not avail itself of University life newly opened to it.

Q. Were the prominent men who had been connected with the Catholic body in England the best calculated to adorn it?

A. Unhappily it was the reverse. Donne the poet and conspicuous Dean of St. Paul's was an apostate. Dryden's earlier works were bad, and his conversion, being unjustly suspected as insincere, made little impression. Pope, though he was brought up a Catholic, lived a Deist. Gibbon no sooner became a Catholic than he repudiated Christianity. The Cause was not helped by the laymen who differed from the Episcopate in the early part of the nineteenth century and, had it not been for Milner's heroic efforts, might have dragged the Church not only in Great Britain but in Ireland and in the Colonies into schism. The saints, both martyrs and confessors, were hidden from the eyes of our ancestors. Not till a priest, Lingard, wrote his history were any of our writers appreciated. Butler was hardly known.

Q. Is it important to know at least in out-

line the history of the Church in this country before the Great Change?

A. Very important and for this reason—that we may thus become acquainted with the causes that have united to bring about our present condition. Our great concern is with the present hopes and fears of Catholicism, and looking back on the calamities and trials of the past we find the best means to avoid the difficulties and perils of the future.

Q. Is the whole topic under consideration one of infinite importance?

A. The idea of England's re-conversion is beyond expression important. To speak glibly of it as if it were within the horizon of accomplishment proves how little the enormity of the task has been compassed in sober judgment. There does not appear any instance on record of a people losing the Faith and, as a body, recovering it. This country not only lost the faith but repudiated it—and as a unit repudiates it to the present hour. The wilful retention up to yesterday in the Statute Book of the Royal Denunciation proves this.

Q. What should be borne in mind by those who earnestly and thoughtfully labor for the propagation of the Faith in England?

A. That the mass of the people are unac-

quainted with the rudiments of the Catholic religion—the Incarnation is not a doctrine in any way clear or defined to them. A general indistinctness is the prevailing hue of their mental attitude towards the Faith. To begin therefore at the beginning in expounding to our friends what we believe (to those who ask and those who listen)—this is our work.

Q. Are not the very words in which some doctrines are enshrined in English both perplexing and misleading to the vast body of the people?

A. Yes—an intricate and esoteric dogma such as that of *Indulgence* is one which comes before the passing notice of the many and so far from attracting, merely confuses and repels the untutored understanding. For instance, it often happens that a chapel or church is opened with episcopal ceremony in a locality where Catholicism has not been familiar or ever explained since the Reformation. An *Indulgence* of forty days is proclaimed to the congregation. We do not realize the indistinctness of such an announcement in the ears of the hearers assembled. Thousands in this land think, (if they think at all about it,) that an indulgence is a permit to indulge in human weaknesses. The mere word is an inadequate

vehicle of what is meant to be conveyed. Words must be considered in the sense in which the listener receives and assimilates them. Vehicles of thought which are not adequate and expressions which do not explain themselves are but aggravations of popular misapprehensions. "*Indulgence*" is one of them.

Q. In considering the whole subject of the idea entertained by our predecessors of England's conversion is it not essential to try to enter into their mind?

A. Most essential. They appear to have had in their mind, that is, in the intellectual outlook common to them all, some roseate vision of our country's speedy return to the Faith. Wishing ardently for the desired end they minimized to a surprising degree the frowning obstacles in the way.

Q. Is it not difficult and almost impossible to realize their feelings based on such unsubstantial hopes?

A. We must go back as far as we can and endeavor to see as they saw and to test their prophecies by their experiences and not by our own, which are too sadly ripe and too sadly true. All was flourishing and smiling in their eyes—and the method of action adopted in their optimism was fallacious. The whole

little world in which they conversed was tinged by their bright visions of an immediate Return. The consideration of the enormous expansion of that world since their days will help us to understand this. A few men could then command, if not a following, at least a hearing. The "education" of the masses since 1870 has raised the millions to a new level. Men who think they are educated read for themselves, will not be led, bow to no chief, discuss controversies which then were far above them, and relying on the slender support of their own new instruction form their conclusions not only on politics, social problems and the like but also on religion. Needless to say their conclusions are mostly faulty.

Q. In reviewing the whole story of the Catholic tendency among so many educated Englishmen during the nineteenth century what is most noticeable?

A. A general solitariness of individual effort. Converts have come into the Church by themselves, lived by themselves, and passed away without having their work shared by others. Loneliness was their motto. Negative disunion chilled their endeavor. United action seems hardly to have been taken, nor was there any union of which they could avail themselves.

They suffered in silence and died. In their own lives they displayed both innocence and strenuous action but it was an isolated life in every case. Suffering indeed there was and much patience, but the warfare was in each man's hand; army there was none. Organization, mutual dependence, sympathy—we look in vain for the record of these things. Each one well realized that his work was to be done in translucent virtue and at the same time on blood-stained paths. *Non in aqua solum, sed in aqua et sanguine.* How such men bound together, animated by a common aim, might have influenced our age! Their influence died with them. Disunion, or rather mere absence of union, has been the bane and the blight of English Catholicism to this hour.

Q. To what cause do you attribute this lack of appreciable influence that might have been expected from such valuable and exemplary lives lived in the midst of our fellow countrymen?

A. Not to the individuals themselves certainly, but to the system of disintegration under which they lived. To the method and economy of our body which has grown up for centuries without the direction of united aim.

Q. Can a system be deficient and inefficient

while those who live under it have wholly admirable qualities?

A. Yes, and they may fail to rejuvenate their system.

Q. Is it essential in studying the system of post-reformation Catholicism in England to investigate how far it was influenced by surrounding Protestantism and how far it reflected the spirit of the Holy See?

A. To arrive at any fair appreciation of it we have to inquire if the idea of compromise in matters of discipline did not obtrude itself on the heirs of the ancient Faith with disastrous result. The excessive anxiety to escape the rigor of the penal laws may have influenced the laity and numbers of the clergy to minimize their differences with their fellow countrymen and to put out of view their intimate communion with the Roman jurisdiction.

Q. If the present generation of Catholics hope to ameliorate the time-encumbered system is it necessary to master the salient facts which have moulded the direction it has been allowed to take so long?

A. The first step is to discover the principal causes which have contributed to make it what it is. The divergences of methods of education have weakened the education of the whole body.

The foundation of such education must be admitted to be the view taken as to the study of Holy Scripture, and in this connexion we find no definite adherence to the idea that the Latin Vulgate is the sole standard of such study. Because those around us have appealed to translations as their text we too have lowered our level by suffering translations to creep in and usurp the place of the standard text—that is our Vulgate. They have despised our Bible, and so accustomed are we to hear of it as a despised thing that we have not vindicated its supreme position and authority.

Q. Is the vindication of the Vulgate as the standard Text of sufficient moment to be considered as an integral element in the question of the progress of Catholicism in England?

A. It is, and it deserves special attention—an attention which it has not received.

Q. In approaching this topic what is the first point to be remembered?

A. That the initial principle of Protestantism is the dissemination of Scripture in the vulgar tongue. I say the principle of Protestantism, not that Protestantism has strictly any principle or intellectual basis, being a mere accumulation of nebulous negations. The very negations it propounds are prefaced with a

"perhaps." But if there is, or was at first, any watchword directing its divergent efforts and energies it was the vulgarization or translation of the Bible. This idea took root in the minds of all the Reformers; they conceived that the opening up of the Biblical treasure to the inspection of the multitude was equivalent to the propagation of the Gospel. So firmly was this theory fixed in their intellectual vision that all other ideas were secondary to it. It pervaded the whole mass of Teutonic Protestantism, whether German or English.

Q. And was the little remnant of the faithful affected in no manner thereby?

A. It cannot be a matter of surprise if the small section which retained the Catholic Faith did but feel itself impelled to meet its opponents on their own ground, and though they never held the absurdity that the learned and unlearned were to seek the Rule of Faith in Scripture only, still, the propriety of having a Bible for every one to read presented itself to their minds. The outcome was the Douai.

Q. Why do you say the *propriety?*

A. Because if "translation" was to be the cry, a good translation and a correct one was better than a false one. All Protestant transla-

tions, it was urged, were faulty and potential in heresy; let there be one without reproach.

Q. Did the Catholics contend that their translation was the Word of God, in the sense that the Vulgate is, that is, the approved Standard Text stamped with the sanction of the Infallible Church?

A. By no means. But as time went on the translation became the reference text and was gradually regarded as *the* Bible—so that insensibly the real Bible of the Church, that is the Vulgate, has ceased to hold its supreme rank.

Q. What then escaped the attention of the Reformers and in a lesser degree of the remaining Faithful who had not fully saturated their minds with the teaching of the Holy See in this connexion?

A. That all versions are potential perversions, all translation is potential mistranslation, and that one language cannot absolutely represent the sense of another.

Q. Is this fact of the highest importance when considered in reference to the renderings of Holy Scripture?

A. Undoubtedly it is, for in the Trinity of tongues nailed once and for ever to the Cross lies the revelation of the Ever Blessed Trinity

itself. Humanly speaking no other language save the Hebrew could express the Dogma of the Eternal God, the Father, the First Person of the Divine Three. No other language save the Greek could unfold the nature of the Son begotten before all worlds, the Logos, the Eternal generation. Latin, the text nearest to the Head of the Incarnate Son when expiring for the salvation of mankind, became the vehicle of the New Law, the medium through which the Infallible Church, inspired by the Holy Spirit and guided by the Third Person of the Triune Godhead, should teach all nations.

Q. Why do you say "humanly speaking"?

A. Because, although with God all things are possible, it is not possible for human intelligence to conceive any other vehicle whereby the Christian revelation could have been ushered into, or continued in the world.

Q. How might the Catholic Faith be justly described?

A. As a living Faith in a dead language.

Q. And Protestantism?

A. A dead faith that time makes ever less and less recognizable, distorted by the controversies of current speech.

Q. What is the main advantage of pre-

serving the Scriptures in a dead language?

A. The impossibility of altering the sense to suit the shifty requirements of modern opinions. The Word of God, like the author thereof, admits of no change or shadow of alteration. Death fixes the standard for ever, and the expression remains for all ages the same. The dignity of the Divine communication is settled and cannot be gainsaid. Of the Scripture it may be even said "Being dead *it* yet speaketh." The majesty of the oracle cannot be dragged down to heresy when safeguarded in a tongue that is spoken no more. Death is the lord of dignity.

Q. Give an instance in which the whole dogmatic sense of the text is ruined and destroyed by "translation."

A. "The Word was made Flesh" is the vulgar rendering of *Verbum caro factum est. Verbum* which here stands for *Logos* cannot possibly by the subtlest distortion mean *Word; factum est* does not mean *made* but *became* as anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of Latin must admit, and *caro* always stands in Scripture for *human nature* or at least not for *flesh.*

Q. Give another instance.

A. "Do this in remembrance of Me." Here

at one blow we find the whole doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass impaired if not destroyed. The Reformers were astute enough to perceive the advantage of "translating" this passage. "*Facite*" undoubtedly may mean and constantly does mean "Offer sacrifice," or "Sacrifice," (imperative), while, "in commemoration of Me," or "for a 'recordation' of Me," would be a more correct rendering of *in Meam commemorationem.*

Q. Are these two instances you have given of great importance?

A. They are translations which not only disfigure but absolutely abrogate two fundamental dogmas of the Catholic Faith, viz. the Incarnation and the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Q. What was perhaps the greatest of the triumphs of Protestantism?

A. Precisely this, to alter the sense of Scripture by translation, and to enjoin that the treatment of Fundamental Doctrine should be "in the vulgar tongue."

Q. Can we be surprised if, from the very beginning of the Reformation epoch to the present day, Protestantism has insisted on the Bible in the vulgar tongues of all peoples being the cardinal principle of its effort and its ambition?

A. Certainly not. For "translation" is a synonym for "alteration" and "perversion," and the very sharpest and most useful tool that heresy could employ.

Q. Are there not passages of Scripture which "translation" often renders ridiculous as well as incorrect?

A. There are many. A living language changes the value of its phrases, and even of its words, from century to century; one may almost say from year to year. That which was a fairly approximate equivalent in one age may totally misrepresent the drift of the original in a subsequent age. It may once have been appropriate to describe the Good Samaritan as handing over twopence for the keep of the subject of his care, whereas nowadays if he could spend no more than twopence on his charitable designs he would be considered not only not generous but to a degree mean. Here "translation" makes a mockery in climax of the entire parable.

Q. Can you quote another specimen?

A. Another fatuous example of "translation" is exhibited in the word "publican." The theory under discussion, as I understand it, maintains the duty of translating the original Scripture into the vulgar tongue, or, as it

is stated in the Twenty-fourth Article, into the language "understanded of the people." By "publican" the people understand a person licensed to keep a retail public house where intoxicating drinks may be drunk on the premises. There is no question as to that. Now wherever a person authorized to collect the Roman taxes is mentioned in the Gospels he is "translated" into a publican by all English Bible-turners. Nor can it even be urged that in Elizabethan times "publican" meant a Roman tax-gatherer or extortioner. Thus the folly of translation presents us with a specimen the strangeness of which can hardly find a parallel.

Q. Indicate a passage in which "publican" is singularly inappropriate.

A. In the Gospel of St. Matthew the Evangelist enumerates the twelve Apostles, himself amongst the number, and he designates himself as *publicanus*. Few more touching texts could be found in Scripture. The other sacred writers in mentioning the Apostle Matthew refrain from naming his profession—but he himself does so. The single word shows the profound humility and self-effacement of the inspired Recorder of the Life of Our Lord. By adding this one

word he gives to all the disciples of the Son of God an example of heroic self-abasement. Apostles, martyrs, confessors, in all ages since, have imitated the humiliation of their Divine Master, but surely none among them has surpassed this humble Evangelist in his lowly devotion. By translating "publicanus" into the English word "publican" the whole passage is rendered ridiculous.

Q. Quote a "translation" where the sense is so absurdly altered as to require no comment.

A. "Strain at a gnat and swallow a camel" where evidently "strain out a gnat" was what the "translator" meant to say—and did not say.

Q. Give a specimen of "translation" which is no translation at all.

A. "He exinanited himself" for *semetipsum exinanivit;* Phil. II. 7.

Q. And yet another specimen of the same kind.

A. "God hath quickened us" in Eph. II. 4, 5. Whatever *quickened* may have meant in archaic English it certainly in our present language does not mean "to give life." Now it means to *accelerate*, which of course does not convey the sense of the passage. This is on a par with the vulgar translation "He shall come to judge

the *quick* and the dead." *Quick* is supposed to do duty for *living*. If we are to have "translations" let them at least be up-to-date.

Q. Do any further samples occur to your memory?

A. The unforgiving though forgiven servant, in the parable, seized his fellow-servant by the throat and "throttled" him, so we are informed by some of our "translators." Then if a man would have faith so as to remove mountains his first qualification must be not to "stagger" in his heart! Again when the Redeemer speaks of Gehenna, a well-known place near Jerusalem where anciently the worship of Moloch was conducted, we find the Teutonic "hell" substituted—"hell" or the *hollow* place of the German after-world having no connexion whatever with the flaming Gehenna. It may be remarked that in the vulgar rendering of the *Credo*, probably in vogue long before the Reformation, Our Blessed Lord is said to have "descended into hell"—this time "hell" has to represent "inferos," a clumsy arrangement, not to say a rather blasphemous one. Indeed so shocking has it appeared to later commentators that they painfully hasten to explain "hell" only means "limbo." Thus they step from the

sublimely blasphemous to the nervously inane —no one being competent to attach any precise meaning to such an indication of the under-world as "limbo."

Q. Quote a "translation" where no effort seems to have been made to construe the Latin word at all.

A. The commencement of the 69th psalm, which the Church constantly adopts as the opening prayer of her Divine office. "Incline unto mine aid" is what we are presented with in this passage. Imagine a beggar begging his bread in such English as this, "Incline to me with a penny." It seems very difficult for us moderns to understand how such renderings as these could have been considered as anything else but ludicrous, even among persons whose acquaintance with English was of the most elementary description.

Q. Can you refer to any passage where by the mere bald rendering of one word the whole of our Lord's discourse is stultified?

A. In Our Lord's prophetic discourse He is represented as declaring that this *generation* shall not pass away until all things are fulfilled. A generation means, in plain English, a very limited period, and something wholly different to the *human race*, which is here indicated.

Q. Passing from isolated texts do you find any vast field of dogmatic discourse wholly vitiated by the "translation" of a single word?

A. The Epistle to the Romans is made to mean exactly the reverse of what it was intended to mean by the bare rendering of *sin* for *peccatum*. The Epistle, which is the most difficult treatise that has ever been composed, entirely rests on the fundamental idea of *peccatum* in the sense of *concupiscence* or *fomes peccati*. By introducing "sin," which in the English language is not an equivalent for *concupiscence*, the whole Christian religion is overthrown, and the extreme tenets of Lutheranism are put in its place.

Q. What term would be synonymous for "translation" in all these cases of dilution of meaning?

A. "Englished" or "Done into English."

Q. To English a text from another language which existed more than a thousand years before English was invented must obviously somewhat alter the meaning?

A. Obviously.

Q. To "English the languages" may be a very ambiguous expression, inasmuch as the English, like every other living tongue, is continually altering?

A. It does not seem to be generally borne in mind that translating the Bible has come to signify turning it into archaic English—a moribund if not altogether a dead language. English in the nineteenth century is almost a different language to the Elizabethan and certainly different to the language of the epoch of Chaucer and Wicklif.

Q. And to turn the Sacred Text into modern English, that is into our own tongue, comes to be regarded as an irreverent thing?

A. Yes; for some reason which is not very clear, archaic English is taken to be a more suitable vehicle for God's Word than modern English. Thus we have God addressed as *Thou* instead of *You*—and every person is to be similarly addressed. Why *Thou* and *Thee*, are better than *You* is not explained. Modern English is just as dignified as ancient. But even waiving the literary point, the contention of Protestantism is that the Bible must be in the common or vulgar tongue. Archaic English is not the vulgar tongue of to-day—and so Protestantism, in confining the translation to an ancient tongue (for archaic English is practically an ancient tongue) goes far to contradict its own argument.

Q. Adduce an instance where archaic Eng-

lish presents the sacred text in a ridiculous and therefore irreverent light.

A. "Peter guessed he saw a vision," in the Wicklif version. Suppose Our Lord were reported as saying "Who, do you guess, is that faithful and wise servant whom his master has appointed over his household?" instead of "thinkest thou"—the text would appear ludicrous to modern English readers, though correct to American readers. *Guess* meant *think*, in the olden times in England. If the Bible is to be translated into modern language it has to be translated into a shifting medium, intelligible at one time or in one community, unintelligible, and perhaps absurd, at another period and in another country.

Q. Are there not some translations which actually border on the profane?

A. "One day in Thy courts is better than a thousand." Here the profanity is shocking. The word "elsewhere" should follow the word "thousand." In another passage we are told that Herodias had the head of John the Baptist brought in "on a charger," which certainly means nowadays a horse ridden by a military officer, and nothing else—it has quite ceased to be a synonym for "dish." This is however merely a ludicrous and not a profane

instance. When however the Apostle speaks of *negotium* in I. Cor. VI. 1 the rendering of it as *business* totally perverts the text, *business* having no bearing whatsoever on the subject he is discussing.

Q. What would you say of the Epistle to the Colossians when Englished and turned out in the vernacular dress?

A. It is, to begin with, the most untranslatable of all the Epistles, and we find it decked out accordingly in a patchwork of unintelligible rhodomontade.

Q. Is this inquiry one merely of academic interest or has it a bearing of extreme importance on the vast question of European religion?

A. Emphatically, it concerns the dividing principles of Catholic and non-Catholic life, inasmuch as the versions or perversions of the sacred text have been made the instruments to wrest the sense of Christian doctrine and to force into it arguments in support of sectarian opinion.

Q. Can any non-Catholic body, by quoting its own edition of Scripture, justify its position?

A. Lutheranism and Calvinism by building their edifice on their own interpretation of Scripture, especially the Epistle to the Romans,

can dexterously show a logical and consistent front. And for this purpose translation, sometimes even of a single word or sentence, can subserve the most anti-Catholic tenets. It is, often, enough to translate wrongly, in order to interpret and expound wrongly. Specious versions become doctrinal perversions. So clearly was this fact understood by the Innovators of the sixteenth century that they spared no pains to represent their particular renderings of the Bible as the most splendid achievements of rejuvenated Christianity.

Q. Can you cite an instance where, as you say, one single word so completely alters the text as to pervert the entire sense?

A. There is one instance so extraordinary as to deserve as much or even more attention than the cases above-mentioned; where the change of translation is an absolute violation of the fundamental import. The fifth commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*, represents fairly enough the original. For this has been substituted "Thou shalt do no murder"—thus excluding suicide. For no one can say that "murder," in English, includes "self-murder" or suicide. The text as it stands, thus Englished, would only imply you must

not kill any one else. The commandment is a prohibition not only from killing others but from killing yourself.

Q. Is there any guarantee in a modern language that the terms of one age shall be equivalent to the terms of another?

A. Not only the verbs and substantives may represent different ideas (and, for all we know, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries "*murder*" may have been equivalent to "*kill*" though certainly it was not always so, for in Hamlet we find "*self-murder*") but even the commonest grammatical constructions were so different that what at one time was correct, later on becomes barbarism and a note of lowest colloquialism. Thus "*you was*" instead of "*you were*" is frequently used in the Augustan age of Anne by the most classical authors.

Q. From what has been said it would appear that the upholders of the Reformation have not hesitated to place the Immutable and Written Word of God in the crazy and ever-varying vehicle of the vernacular. They have employed a confessedly changing medium to convey the fixed and irrefragable message of the Eternal?

A. Yes—and they have gloried in so doing.

They have made it their boast. For them every language on the face of the earth, however deficient, however incapable of enunciating abstract ideas, has appeared adequate to bear the most profoundly difficult propositions of both Old and New Testaments. They have failed to see that the Scriptures in the originals are totally different literature to the diluted, distorted and crudely grotesque versions in present-day languages, languages which for the most part are insufficient to express the mere rudiments of the Divine Theme.

Q, Would it not be just to say that the underlying principle of Protestantism is that, however subject to change a living language must be, the translation of Scripture ought to be perpetually adapted to meet the change, and thus be rendered correct by perpetual emendations?

A. No doubt this is the only logical standpoint for the Protestant theory—but it defeats itself.

Q. How so?

A. It places the sense of the Sacred Text at the mercy of every one who constitutes himself scholar enough to elucidate the true meaning. Scholars, like doctors, will disagree,

and the translation made by one student may, and ever does, militate against the translation at which another has arrived.

Q. There is therefore no finality in the possible renderings of a dead language into the vernacular?

A. There is neither finality nor certainty, and certainty being the objective of all renderings of the Bible, where certainty in this matter fails the whole principle of Protestantism fails with it.

Q. Is it not of the greatest possible importance—of infinite importance—to ascertain the exact sense of Our Lord's words and to prevent any alloy of alteration from being mingled with them? On his own Divine authority His Words are to out-last for ever the dissolution of the Universe. *Cœlum et terra transibunt verba autem mea non præteribunt.*

A. Even so, and therefore they should be till the end of time safeguarded by the fixed setting of unaltered expression.

Q. If it is objected that the Vulgate is itself a translation and consequently a degree removed from the primary utterance?

A. It must be borne in mind that the Vulgate is the most venerable of all Bibles. As far as the Hebrew Scriptures

are concerned it is six or seven hundred years older than any Hebrew original known to exist, and even the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament only date more than a century later than the compilation of the Vulgate. But putting aside the literary consideration, the infallible Church has stamped the Vulgate with her authority and has pronounced it to be the authentic standard not to be disputed. It was laid down by the Council of Trent, that no other exemplar of the Inspired Word is to be admitted as authentic in the Universal Church.

Q. Looking at the subject from an abstract point of view can anything argue a more presumptuous hardihood than the translation of the Divne Oracles by the unlearned into their current and passing vernacular?

A. Nothing could be more rash; and even if all the best scholars in Europe assembled together and devoted their utmost attention to such a task they could give no guarantee that their labours could produce a facsimile in sense to the originals.

Q. Quote a line that might be appropriate to the efforts of such individuals, especially of

those who have no such qualifications for the task and have often attempted it notwithstanding.

A. Pope's line would apply—"And fools rush in where angels fear to tread." The Holy See has always withstood the project of irresponsible translation, and even where it has tolerated Catholic versions it has only sanctioned them so far and on condition that they be conformable to the Vulgate, and even so has never stamped them as authoritative. The Church has never said of any version save her own Vulgate—this is the Bible—this is the written Word of God.

Q. In what circumstances do you find an indication of the Providential care of the text of Scripture and reverence for it that may serve as an example to Christians?

A. Among the Jews even to this day the text of the Law is not printed but preserved on parchment rolls and enclosed in a tabernacle with a lamp before it in the synagogue.

Q. And does not the Church by showing material honour to the very book of the Gospels indicate an equal reverence to the New Testament?

A. Incense is offered round the copy of the Gospels at High Mass—a note of reverence

for the *Written* Word that is very significant.

Q. In combating error in all ages does not the Church quote Scripture, and therefore is it not essential that the Standard text should be relied on and all translation mistrusted?

A. From the beginning she has done so. Even as Our Lord Himself combated the Tempter solely by quotation of Scripture when the Tempter had thrice thought to pervert him by misquotations of Holy Writ, so, too, the Church brings forward her true expositions of Scripture to disprove the false translations and interpretations of her enemies.

Q. Does the word "translation" represent the real idea when applied to the rendering of Scripture into a vernacular?

A. No, *substitution* would be more accurate. The fact is that in translating, the best substitutes a modern language can produce are made to do duty for the original words and phrases, and rarely hit off the original sense. In the work of persons who are indifferent scholars the very substituted words are often not the best that could have been used.

Q. Are these inaccurate *substitutions* so numerous as to defy enumeration?

A. In every chapter, almost every verse they abound. The Sacred Library which is perversely called "The Bible" in the singular as if it consisted of one single book, has been so metamorphosed by successive generations of word-substituters that no doctrinal error, however grotesque, but may be propped by a sanction somewhere within it.

Q. And do the most painstaking word-substituters of the Vulgate break down in their endeavours as pitifully as those who profess to translate what they opine to be the original text?

A. By professing exact literalness they issue in obscurity. St. Paul is made to speak of his "daily instance, the care of all the churches," —*instance* being a singular mode of elucidating the Apostle's idea. Then we have "Do penance" for *Pœnitentiam agite*, quite an improbable if not an impossible version. Here Archbishop Kenrick comes to the rescue and advocates "Repent," whereupon he is almost vituperated as unorthodox. Equally, if not more serious is "What is it to me and to thee?" for *Quid mihi et tibi?* When we consider that the same words occur in the speech of the *dæmonia* it is not very illiterate to presume the expression, identically the same, may have

the identically same sense in both passages—viz. the simple "What have I in common with thee?" Then all translations, heretical or orthodox, are apt to fall foul of *Quinimo beati.* If "quinimo" is to appear in bald English as "Yea rather," translators in many other passages may go to hazardous lengths in their lucubrations and impugn the loftiest doctrines. *Quinimo* is a word the contemporary sense of which we may discuss with reverent hesitation, but to bluntly turn it into an English phrase which implies an inferiority of beatitude in the August Subject to whom reference is being made, surely this is the height or rather the depth of ignorant rashness.

Q. Do not passages like these, which could be multiplied *ad nauseam*, suggest a very serious reflection?

A. They suggest the parable of a great potentate delivering a message in writing to a vast empire of which he is the conqueror. Here the conqueror dies and his ambassadors to many subject kings unroll the parchment, and, with literary appreciation unequal to their impetuosity, translate and curtail and expand, and generally mutilate and garble the text in barbarous languages—fitted especially, as they think, to the understanding of the various

kings and peoples in their mother-tongues. There is on earth one interpreter of the potentate's meaning who is endowed with unmistaking knowledge of the text, but he is disregarded. Each knows better than the other the true sense. So the Empire hears in its different provinces a different tale—to the lasting confusion of laws, ethics and fraternal fellow-feeling.

Q. What portion of the Scripture is most commonly used, and the topic of mistranslation therefore most frequently brought before the critical faculty?

A. The Lord's Prayer—the repetition of which is made more frequently than of any other text in the whole Bible.

Q. Is it therefore of supreme importance to examine the phraseology of the Lord's Prayer and compare it with the sense presented by the original text?

A. Yes, and to compare the degenerate vernacular with the pure and undistorted model of prayer given to mankind by the authority and command of Christ Himself.

Q. Give a brief exposition of the text.

A. To begin with, *Our Father* is not the equivalent to *Father of us* which we find in the Greek, absolutely without variation in

any known manuscript. The equivalent in English would be *Father of us all*—the *all* being a necessary expletive. *Father of us all* might also fairly represent *Pater noster*—it would be against the grain of Latin to write *Pater nostri—Pater noster* is quite an equivalent for Πάτερ ἡμῶν—but *Our Father* is not.

Q. What is to be said of *Which art?*

A. That it is not English. If *which*, the neuter, did duty for *who*, the masculine, in old days well and good—we live in new days and speak a tongue contemporary with ourselves. The Catholic vulgar translation "Who art" has certainly the advantage. The ancient Douai strangely has "Which art."

Q. And what of *in heaven?*

A. A limited and therefore dangerous version. For *heaven*, at least in poetry, only conveys the idea of a place of reward or happiness —and the Lord's prayer is not in poetry but in prose. How do we know but that the plural of *cœlum* here used may indicate *the heavens*, that is to say, illimitable space? Says the Hebrew prophet in unsurpassed magnificence of diction "Thou who dwellest in Eternity."

Q. Is the next "translation" satisfactory, namely, *Hallowed be Thy Name?*

A. Hardly so, for the more approximate meaning—*Let your attributes be ever regarded as the perfection of holiness*—is not represented by archaic language sufficiently. If it is a mark of reverence to use in the Lord's prayer words four hundred years old, why is it not incumbent to speak of "All Hallows" instead of "All Saints"? Is there anything derogatory to religion to use modern good English such as *sanctified* or *saint?* Is it more reverent to be medieval than to accommodate ourselves to the parlance of our own twentieth century? The truth is that Protestantism recoils from its own conclusions. It starts with the fundamental theory of "translation" and when it translates the Word of God it shrinks with horror in imagining the vulgar tongue rather too much akin to vulgarity and slang. Therefore it clings to pre-classical, archaic, obscure and old-world English, which to the mass of the millions born, is as dark as the Latin. This strange oscillation of mind between dislike of the Catholic Latin and mistrust of everyday English tries to escape from all dilemma in the adoption of medieval expression. Thus there are some who write *Our Ladie,* and *Blessed Marie—Lady* and *Mary* are too modern for them! As in old

English *Holy Ghost* appeared as *Holighoste*, all one word, perhaps they will, if consistent, adopt that nomenclature also as the more euphonious!

Q. Why did you speak of a "more approximate meaning" at the beginning of your last answer?

A. Because it is of paramount importance to disclaim absolute identity between the translated and the original. Over and over again it should be repeated that to extract from their dark mine Divine oracles and to fuse the pure metal with the alloy of the vernacular, is to degrade and to misrepresent them. If carefully done into the new form and under scrupulously accurate supervision, the alloy may be very little and may hardly interfere with the *general* sense. That is the best which can be said of the process. But what words can express the baseness and the wickedness of mixing the alloy so as to suit private notion (which is so often the case)—in repudiating the Original and claiming for the pseudo-text the authority or Holy Writ!

Q. How is the *Sanctificetur nomen tuum* Englished in the original Douai?

A. *Let thy Name be sanctified*—which is a sentence quite in harmony with modern English.

Q. What is the vulgar rendering of *Adveniat regnum tuum?*

A. *Thy kingdom come.* Why it is not better to say *Let thy kingdom come* is not explained.

Q. How does "translation" deal with the next petition but one?

A. Fairly and correctly. The "daily" here follows the text as used in the Liturgy and not the "supersubstantialem" of the Vulgate. The *quotidianum* must be regarded, as a representation of ἐπιούσιον, to be equally authorized by the Church as *supersubstantialem* is.

Q. Is the next petition free from objection in its common English dress?

A. Quite the contrary. Any stranger perversion of Scripture can hardly be imagined. The text has *debita* and *debitoribus,* (the text is from Matthew not from Luke,) nothing therefore could be simpler than to turn this into *debts* and *debtors.* The authors of the English version seem to have gone out of their way to change the sense—the idea of "trespass" being wholly alien to the idea of "debt." Few instances can be more remarkable than this of the wresting of Holy Writ from its plain meaning to a new notion in the process of translation. It cannot be even urged that here the translators have introduced the text

of Luke—for though *sins* (hardly *trespasses,* but let that pass,) figure in Luke, the second portion of the sentence emphasises *debts* as strongly as does the text of Matthew. The translators, for some reason that is lost in the remoteness of history, abolished altogether the idea of *debt* in the Lord's Prayer—a proceeding against which it is impossible to protest too strongly.

Q. What remarks do you make on the common versions of the *Ne nos inducas in tentationem?*

A. A great difficulty confronts us here. If we ask God not to lead us into temptation we are asking Him not to do what He is incapable of doing, for "God tempts no man." Translate *tentatio* by *trial,* in the sense of trial which is too great for our strength, and the difficulty is lessened. May not *tentatio* have signified *trial?* According to the vulgarized Scripture "God tempted Abraham." Surely not. "God *tried* Abraham." The French translate the *Ne nos* "Let us not succumb to temptation." They, to get rid of an embarrassment, unjustifiably amplify the text—going in boldly for *paraphrase* not *version.* O the wisdom of the Church in guarding the Latin text safe from all unorthodox meddling! *Tentatio*

is the true and only authorized equivalent of πειρασμός. Translate and you fall into inaccuracy.

Q. How does the Lord's Prayer according to Matthew in the Vulgate conclude?

A. *Sed libera nos a malo.* The vulgar rendering *But deliver us from evil* entirely dispenses with the definite article which is so significant in the original text, and which the Latin, as that language has no definite article, should be presumed to contain in *malo.* "Deliver us from the evil," or "Deliver us from the Evil One" opens up a very comprehensive meaning which is lost in the mere word *evil. The evil,* or *The evil One* or the *evil Thing* does not coincide in idea with *evil.* Here again *translation* degenerates into adaptation, and yet another instance is afforded of the danger of departing from the Latin exemplar which the Church places before us.

Q. What practical inference is to be drawn from such observations on the Lord's Prayer?

A. That if it be repeated in Latin, it is by that very fact safeguarded from all danger of false rendering, and even of false doctrine, which insinuates itself into the ever shifting expression of the vernacular.

Q. And this possible insinuation is incident to the whole translation of Scripture?

A. Even so, and here we find the inspired motive of the Church, which in the face of obloquy, opposition and the shameful accusation of desire to conceal and abrogate the Written Word, has with undeviating constancy fenced the Sacred Text within the citadel of her own language.

Q. If even a profound scholar attempts to render Scripture in the vernacular so as to be "understanded of the people" to what alternatives is his method reduced?

A. If in classical English, it issues in loftiness of style, as far above the people's intelligence as the original is,—if in colloquial utterance, it ends in irreverence,—if in literal wording, it becomes ungrammatical. The magnificent version possessed by the English nation—King James's Bible—is loftiness of diction and nobility of speech *in excelsis*, but it has to avoid literalness to maintain that high standard. "God forbid" which occurs over and over again in the Pauline Epistles is grand, no doubt, but it has no affinity with *absit* or with the two Greek words that correspond to *absit*. It comes to this, if you avoid literalness you must seek an equivalent—an equivalent is but thinly distinguished from a paraphrase—a paraphrase admits of a mixture

of private idea with the original sense,—this compound may, and indeed often does, emerge into unorthodoxy.

Q. Give an instance of translation being turned into amplification.

A. *Salve Regina* means *Hail Queen*, but is universally in England changed into *Hail Holy Queen*. Probably at some remote date a well-meaning person thought the expression sounded nicer, and thus the perversion of the text has obtained in all the recitations of the anthem. Leo XIII. suggested the repetition of the *Salve Regina* after low mass. The Pope therefore said "Say *Salve Regina*," and he never could have contemplated anything but the sublime Latin. In Germany it is said in the vernacular, but no "holy" is inserted. In England a new word is interpolated—"holy." Now mark the importance of this deviation from the letter of the law. If you may insert one word according to your fancy, obviously you may insert another or, for that matter, a hundred others. You might put in a whole list of epithets—such as *Immaculate, Blessed, Gentle, Gracious*, or the like, on the authority of your own devotion and fancy. This instance is a good one as showing the weakness and fatuity of the theory of trans-

lation, for you cannot open your mouth to commence the *Salve Regina* without immediately thrusting in another word which is not in the text and which is sanctioned by your imagination alone, certainly not by the Pope.

Q. Apply these observations to "Scripture turning."

A. The whole basis of doctrinal Christianity depends on using the right words and applying the right meaning to them. If a bad man seeks to corrupt the faith he will add his own condiment of thought to the wholesome food of the Gospel. Now his thoughts cannot exist but in words, nor can they issue except in words. If therefore he puts in words to destroy, the creed is destroyed. If a good and devout scholar, being but a fallible man, translates and amplifies by putting in fancy expletives, he may destroy the creed in the same way. The result will be the same whether perversity or mere devout ignorance be at work.

Q. Give an instance of the most absurd vernacular.

A. *Teach me thy justifications.* Presumably *orders* are meant. Imagine a servant asking his master "What are your justifications this

morning?" or a lieutenant-colonel issuing to his battalion "The justifications of the day." Yet what is utterly ridiculous in modern English is considered quite good enough to express the sublime prayer of the inspired Psalmist.

Q. Quote a more glaring example of the difficulty of translating.

A. St. Paul speaks of longing for all the Philippians *in visceribus Jesu Christi* that is to say, in the Heart of Jesus Christ. We find in translations the *bowels* of Jesus Christ. *Viscera* never meant *bowels*: it means *vitals*, here indicating the *heart*. Yet the very people who would shrink with horror from naming devotions to the Sacred Heart *devotions to the Sacred Bowels*, and would consider it blasphemous to dedicate churches and chapels to the Sacred Bowels, never dream of objecting to the same expression in their adulterated edition of the Epistles. But there is a far worse instance. Our holy mother, the Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all the churches, had from time immemorial exhorted her children to repeat the exact words uttered by Elizabeth, mother of St. John Baptist, when Our Lady visited her—*Benedictus fructus ventris tui.* So the Vulgate gives them. The

Greek is ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου. Incredible as it may appear, the delicacy of the expression was utterly cancelled by the early barbarians of our uncultured country, who substituted the word "womb," apparently going out of their way to improve on the Roman Church and Scripture itself, when neither one nor the other reads *uterus*.

Q. How would you alter such defects?

A. By always repeating the *Pater noster* and the *Ave Maria* in the divine Latin, which Providence has arranged should be the only official language of the Apostolic Faith. Latin, the language of the empire under which the Son of God chose to spend His human life, was nearest of the three tongues on the cross to His adorable Head when He expired.

Q. Give an extract from Wicklif's Bible showing the immense distance our language has travelled since the 14th century, and proving the fact that a solemn story in *that* English may become something very different in *our* English. In this extract we find "guess" signifies "think" as it does in America now.

A. The eighth chapter of the *Dedis of Aposlis* will furnish an example. "Lo a myghti man-seruaunt a gelding of candace the

queene of ethiopieans which was on alle hir richessis cam to worschipe in ierusalem. and he turnyde aghen sitting in his chare and redynge isaie the profete. and the spirit seide to philip, nygh thou and ioyne thee to this chare. and philip run to and herde hym redynge isaie the profete. and he seide, gessist thou wher thou understondist what thingis thou redist? and he seide, how may I if no man shewe to me? and he preide philip that he shulde come up and sit with hym. and the place of scripture that he redde was this: as a sheep he was led to sleyng, and as a lombe bifore a man that scherith hym is doumbe without voice, so he openyde not his mouth. in mehenesse his doom was taken up, who schal tell out the generation of hym? for his lyf shal be taken away from the earthe. and the gelding answeride to philip and seide, I biseche thee of what profete seith he this thing? [de quo propheta dicit hoc?] of hymsilf either of ony othir? and philip openyde his mouth and bigan at this scripture and prechide to hym ihesus. and the while thei wenten bi the weie thei camen to a watir. and the gelding seide, lo watir, who forbedith me to be baptised? and philip seide, if thou bileeuest of al the

herte it is lefful. and he answered and seide, I bileeve that ihesus crist is sone of god. and he commaunded the chare to stonde stille, and thei wenten doun both into the watir, philip and the gelding, and philip baptiside hym. and when they weren come up of the watir, the spirit of the Lord rauyschide [rapuit] philip, and the gelding sigh hym no more, and he went in his weie ioiynge, and philip was foundun in azotus and he passide forth and prechide to all citees til he cam to cesarie."

Q. What illustration can be given to demonstrate the wrongness of the Protestant principle of translation into the vernacular?

A. Something of this kind. In a far country the recipient of a letter from his dearest friend at home translates it into the current language of the natives for their benefit. Only partially master of the language the translator makes an infinity of absurd mistakes. The document becomes a source of amusement—a butt of ridicule. All unconscious of his error, the owner of the letter thinks he has done a kind thing by imparting European news to his new companions. So it is with "Bible turning." Great Britain spends millions of money in translating the Word of God into endless

tongues, (even the Turanian tongues, not to speak of the African,) which cannot be vehicles for the theology of Revelation. Cowper wrote of Voltaire that

> "The Bible was his jest-book whence he drew
> *Bon mots* to vex the Christian and the Jew."

If Voltaire founded his arguments on the translations in vogue, he must have been easily furnished with weapons of ridicule against the Divine Originals, which he could not comprehend.

Q. How would you describe (if one cannot *define*) the principle of Protestantism?

A. The Principle of Protestantism (if indeed it is possible for a Negation to have a principle)—is the Diffusion of Scripture in the vernacular. It is essential therefore to bear in mind that the Scripture in the vernacular is not *the* Scripture—that all translation dilutes or alters or even corrupts —that as flowers in a bowl of water become at last putrid and a horror both to sight and smell, so the Word of God in dilution becomes in a very acute sense "the letter which killeth."

Q. How can we practically help the solution of all these difficulties?

A. By doing all in our power to aid the Holy See in the encouragement of the study of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin in the seminaries. Already the present Pontiff has introduced the study of Greek (without which no man can be called "educated,") into the seminaries of Italy, uniting the small seminaries into fewer large establishments, for in poor and ill-equipped institutions how can good professors be supported—how can any scholarship thrive? Let us ever remember that clerical learning demands (like every other learning) financial support—prizes and emoluments.

Q. But what principle should underlie and support any such efforts?

A. It can hardly be irreverent to say with all seriousness, that as there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are One, so on earth there are three witnesses to the Trinity, the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin, and these three agree in one. Being united on the Cross they become the instrument of God's Word, and the Holy See is the inheritor and the guardian of their glories.

Q. Referring again to the necessity of

studying the Vulgate in the light of the originals, what should be said of the absence of the definite article in Latin, which is so important in Hebrew and Greek?

A. There are many instances in the New Testament alone where the article should be remembered as strengthening the meaning. Our Lord said, *This day thou shalt be with Me in the Paradise.* The Paradise, a name for the *Garden* or *Park* of Eden and also for that Place of detention of expectant, blessed spirits, is not quite equivalent to the vague and undefined word "Paradise." Again, Our Lord said, *I am with you all the days even to the consummation of the œon.* Mark the article *the* days—the appointed days, the determined time. St. Paul wrote that God *has given Him the name which is above every name.* Here the definite article is almost or altogether an assertion of Christ's Divinity. *The* Name indicates the Incommunicable name of God. *A* name is a very different idea. It may be remarked in connexion with this topic that English with the indefinite article yields a different note of meaning in thousands of sentences to the meaning conveyed by contemporary languages which possess no indefinite article. A great obstacle to perfect

intercommunication among Europeans is thus created. For instance, "Give me one ticket" at a booking-office would mean in English "not two tickets." On the continent *ein*, *un*, *uno*, would only mean *a* ——. It is well to bear in mind examples of this kind, and to think that if such differences exist in modern everyday languages, what may the differences be between modern expression and the languages that have been dead for a thousand years.

Q. Can you quote a few samples of the unhappy condition to which the English of "treasuries of devotion" has been reduced by the incessant shrinkage of classical education during the last century or so—the preference of the vulgar, (very vulgar,) tongue to the Latin of the Church?

A. Some of the treasures taken at random from our "treasuries" are as follows: "Vessel of singular devotion," where the compiler thought *insigne* was the genitive and quite comfortably imagined a form *insignæ* to exist. In a "fifth edition" of an *Officium Defunctorum*, all in Latin except the rubrics, we find the canticle of Ezechias intituled the Canticle of Ezechiel. Devout editor in some past century! your tranquillity of mind was never

troubled by the genitive of Ezechias or any discrepancy between Hezekiah and Ezechiel, and the fifth edition was as the first! But in a well-bound and popular manual we read in a "meditation" that Our Lord said "*With desire I have desired to drink this chalice with you*," and the reference afforded us is Luke xii. 15. This is shocking, simply shocking. When we come to a prayer ending with the promise to the penitent Thief and rounded off with "who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost"—i.e. the Penitent Thief liveth &c. in the Trinity!—we wonder if in any other body of religionists in the world people would dare to compile books who have never learnt the difference between the second and third persons singular. But in connexion with this text of Scripture a novel-writer quotes it thus,—"*Amen, I say unto thee, this day thou shalt sup with me in Paradise.*" Certainly this is not in a manual of devotion, but it is worth recording as a token of the slovenliness of reference. The author, who quotes elsewhere from the Douai, labours to show there will be refreshment above from the argument of "supping." After this the mixing up of "you" and "thou" in petitions to our Blessed Lady are mild phenomema,

"you" in one line "thou" in the next, page after page. In the Litany of the Sacred Heart, "Heart of Jesus glutted with reproaches" is revolting. In a translation of Psalm xxxi. we read, "With bit and bridle bind fast their jaws, who come not near to Thee," the good printer thinking *Thee* referred to the Divinity, and the text becomes mixed with horses and mules! A deplorable rendering occurs in the Mass Englished for the benefit of the purchaser of a choice morocco-bound prayer-book,—"Per manus Sancti Angeli" comes out as "angels." One wonders what possible idea of the Liturgy such compilers can have. As for "Incline unto mine aid, O Lord," that blots every "manual" from calf to vellum and gilt edges. How melancholy! *Usquequo Domine, usquequo?*

Q. In translating Hebrew the divergence between modern renderings may be very wide. Can you give two instances to remember as specimens of thousands of others?

A. In Gen. iv. 7, we find *Sub te erit appetitus ejus, et tu dominaberis illius.* Here the rendering that Abel is to look up to Cain and be under his domination is quite different to the possible and probable sense that *the violent desire of sin shall be to possess*

Cain. But do thou have the dominion (the mastery) of it. This is the prophetic, the divinely worded summing-up of the whole of the ethic of Christianity; for sin is ever knocking at the door of the heart ready to get in, and sanctifying grace enables the will to resist. Another instance to commit to memory—Gen. xlix. 22, *Filiæ discurrerunt super murum.* This does not mean "the young women have run out on the wall" or the rampart, but in the grand, though material Semitic imagery it indicates that the branches bearing grapes, *the daughters of the vine*, have grown far and wide over the wall and are a source of wealth to their owner.

Q. Are not such specimens to be numbered by thousands, and if so, what is to be concluded?

A. It is evident that a thousand scholars doing their best to translate could give you as many different versions of the Bible. This applies not merely to the Old Testament but to the New as well.

Q. Quote a passage where the poetical images are entirely changed in translation and where the Latin Vulgate and the LXX. should be read in conjunction with the Hebrew to arrive at the probable sense.

A. "Glorious art Thou, Excellent from the mountain of prey. The stout-hearted have been spoiled, they have sunk into their sleep, and none of the men of valour have found their hands. At Thy rebuke, O God of Jacob, both chariot and horse are cast into a dead sleep" (i.e have died.) (Ps. lxxv. *Heb.*) Here the Vulgate *Illuminans tu mirabiliter a montibus æternis*—exactly coincides with the LXX. and conveys the magnificent idea of God in His Infinite perfection casting light on the world from the Orient of his Everlasting Law and the radiance of His Revelation; but the sense of the Hebrew—"mountains of prey"—points merely to lonely mountains where beasts of prey wander. Again, the LXX. and the Vulgate in οἱ ἐπιβεβηκότες ἵππους must be referring to the Assyrians *driving chariots* as the innumerable representations pourtrayed on the walls of Egyptian palaces and Assyrian temples show.

Q. But passing from these Hebrew intricacies of text, is there no strength in the Protestant argument that *simple* passages can be turned simply without the slightest variation of meaning, and we need not ponder on the difficulties when all that is essential is so plain?

A. This suggestion at once falls to the ground when we reflect that "*Do this*" in the Institution of the Eucharist is not correct. *Hoc facite* may and does mean *Make* or *offer* this *sacrifice*. The Latin and the Latin derived languages have no precise word for "*do*." *Facere* (Fr. *faire* It. *fare*) may mean "*make*" as well as "*do*." "*Do this*" represents the Eucharist as a mere commemorative feast, eliminating all idea of *offering*. Thus one single word has been in translation the pillar and ground of innumerable Protestant heresies in England and wherever the English tongue prevails. But if we come to a passage where at first sight all possibility of variation of meaning seems utterly out of the question, so simple it is, so plain, so easily understood even by children, what do we find? Even there we perceive a different sense from the sense in the Original. *Bonus pastor*, does not mean *Good shepherd*, for in the Greek the adjective is καλός. Now καλός is not the same as ἀγαθός. Plato uses the word καλός (*cultivated*) as opposed to ἄγριος (*wild*). It bears here more the idea of *owner* [sc. of the sheep]. *Bonus* has the sense of καλός here. Cp. Rom. xi. 24. Again in the rendering of Mark xvi. 16, *He shall be damned*

(E.V.) or, *He shall be condemned* (DOUAI), what divergence of translation and what infinite divergence of thought! How strong the guardianship the Holy See exerts over the sacred text in not sanctioning as authentic any or every idea that this or that translator may have! Yet again in Our Lord's parable, *The lord praised the unjust steward;* how evil is the presentment of this text. All Christianity falls to the ground if the Lord praises wicked men. *The master* not *the lord* would be a more correct translation. So much for "simplicity" in mere words! For who among the unlettered throng of listeners knows whether "the Lord" is spelt here with a capital L or a small l?

Q. What is to be said as to the ludicrous nature of much that is transmuted from one language to another?

A. Even in modern languages what absurdities occur! Such are the gilded letters over the tavern at Alexandria "Opera's Coffee," a serious rendering of *Café de l'Opéra*, and meaning presumably *At the sign of the Opera house.* But when we open the Anglican Psalms how strange the following sounds, sung as it is repeatedly. *Moab is my washpot, over Edom will I cast out my shoe, Philistia be thou*

glad of Me. How can Scripture be reverenced when on the translation theory such riddles are presented to the worshipper? By the way, the Vulgate *Olla spei meæ (Ps. lx. 10)* and *Lebes spei meæ (Ps. cvii. 10)* and the rest mean nothing of the kind. The fact is, real dignity of language resides only in death. If a boy is the butt of ridicule among his schoolfellows, so that he is laughed at even every day, and then dies, he is not laughed at any more—no! not once. The majesty of death does not admit of insult and contumely. Take a greater, the greatest instance of this the World has ever seen or can see. They mocked Our Lord, they derided Him, they blindfolded Him, they asked Him to guess who it was that struck Him. They mocked Him even on the cross. But when He died the mockery, the laughter was at an end for ever. The Evangelists record no blasphemy of ridicule *then.* Thus the sacred languages nailed to the Cross are indeed dead and cannot be ridiculed. They live again in the life of the Church, but they cannot be blasphemed. Hence while the cry is "Simplicity of Scripture for the learned and unlearned alike," when we come to the truth, we discover that the Church in her infallible

wisdom, by safeguarding Holy Writ in the original tongues, has recognized the profound mystery and the awful intricacy of the text to be, in the final stage, as unsearchable and as hidden as the human heart itself.

CHRISTIANITY

AND

LANGUAGE

BY

JOSEPH RICKABY S.J. M.A.

Nihil obstat

B. V. MILLER

Censor Deputatus

Imprimatur

✠ EDUARDUS

Ep. Birminghamiensis

die 8 Maii, 1911.

Christianity and Language.

In the Bull *Aeternus ille* of Sixtus V., introducing the Sixtine edition of the Latin Vulgate Bible, these words occur: "God, the eternal Creator and Ruler of all things in heaven and on earth, with His own right hand as a provident husbandman did wonderfully plant His holy Church for a paradise of delights with various plants and herbs, and further did irrigate it with the abundant fountain of the Divine Scriptures divided in many streams all over the earth, in such manner that the holy mysteries and divine oracles, contained in the sacred books, though given for the salvation of all nations, were nevertheless chiefly announced in those three languages which most of all have become familiar in the ears of all nations, and which, being consecrated by the title of the Holy Cross, have preached our Saviour's Kingdom in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin (John xix. 19, 20)."

The three languages of the Cross, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the vehicles of God's revelation

in Scripture,—also of the Church's doctrinal and legislative pronouncements,—also of the Liturgy whereby the Church officially worships God,—the necessity of translations from these languages into the vernacular, and at the same time the loss necessarily incurred by such translation,—the desirability of our young ecclesiastics being taught to read the Scriptures in Greek at least, if not in Hebrew,—the preference claimed for the Latin Liturgy of the Church over English 'Devotions,' —these are the topics dealt with in this Lecture, and to be dealt with yet more fully in Lectures to follow, it is hoped, in succeeding years.

As illustrating the importance of my subject, let me notice at the outset an objection that has been made against the Church's claim to teach ever the same doctrine. The objection is this, that dogma being couched in language, must change as language changes, its formularies not meaning the same thing from one generation to another. As well may you argue that weights and measures must alter, being worn away in daily use. To prevent this, there are kept,—by Government,—standard weights and standard measures, which, not coming into any commercial use, remain ever the same, and can be appealed to in case of dispute. Similarly the doctrines of the Church are preserved in Greek and Latin, which, as dead

languages, are withdrawn from the changes incident to our every-day speech. From those dead languages the clergy learn, and from them they teach the people, ever the same doctrine. This difficulty need not detain us further.

Sydney Smith said: "Nothing gains by translation except a bishop:" to which another wag added, "and sometimes a diocese." So thought the fourteenth century rhymester, a monk of Ely, who celebrated the translation of Simon of Langham to Canterbury in the leonine verse:

Laetentur coeli quia Simon transit ab Ely.

How be it soever about bishops, books certainly have nothing to gain, and much to lose, by translation. Of no two languages do the words exactly correspond with one another. Thus in a long passage, every word of importance being slightly under-translated, or over-translated, the whole translation may come to vary considerably from the original. The variations will be greater as the languages are further remote from one another, as East from West, and again as the original represents a mode of thought specially characteristic of the particular people to whom it belongs. Take any passage of Shakespeare at random, and think how you would put it into Latin, Greek, or Arabic, and what the native Roman, Athenian, or Arab,

would gather from your translation, however grammatically exact. For instance the following (King Lear, act iv. sc. 6).

> Through battered clothes small vices do appear:
> Robes and furred gowns hide all. Plate sin with gold,
> And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks:
> Arm it in rags, a pigmy's straw does pierce it.
> None does offend, none, I say; I'll able 'em.
> Take that of me, my friend, who have the power
> To seal the accuser's lips. Get thee glass eyes,
> And like a scurvy politician, seem
> To see the things thou dost not.

Shakespeare goes ill into French; nor would it be a hopeful task to have to translate Newman into Italian. Even though you keep the main sense, you still lose the spirit and ethos of the passage. The wine may be poured without loss of a drop from vessel to vessel, but the bouquet is lost. Yet it must be allowed that unless you are very familiar with the language of the original, you will gain more on the whole by reading it in a good translation. I have heard Newman read aloud in English by an Italian professor, on whom, as his comments showed, the delicate suggestiveness of that myriad-minded writer was quite thrown away. It is desirable, I say, for our clergy to know Greek and Hebrew, and the better, the better. As the New Testament touches us more

nearly, they should at least know Greek: some of them should know it very well; as many as possible, moderately well. But it is not necessary to know Homeric Greek, nor Ionic Greek, nor the Greek of the Tragedians, nor even the Attic prose that Socrates spoke and Plato wrote: what is wanted is Hellenic Greek, the language of St. Luke and St. Paul. Much misunderstanding is created, and much difficulty in practice, from people not remembering that under the head of 'Greek' is comprehended a group of dialects,—I had almost said, languages,—differing from one another nearly as much as Italian from Spanish. Boys give up Greek, and take to football, when their master might have kept them at their desks by offering to teach them one dialect only, being at the same time himself in that one dialect thoroughly competent. It is desirable for young clerics to learn New Testament Greek.

But, it may be demanded, the Vulgate Latin is put in our hands by the Church, it is declared by the Council of Trent to be 'authentic,' what need ever to travel beyond the Vulgate? The answer to this question carries with it the history of the Latin Vulgate.* There was a Latin version of the Old and New Testament as early as the

* For the substance of what follows I am indebted to Father Cornely, S.J., *Introductio Generalis ad S. Scripturam*, p.p. 375—500.

second century of our era. This is the version known as the *Itala*. Notwithstanding its name, it was not made in Italy, but in Northern Africa. There was no demand in Rome for a Latin Bible during the first two centuries, for this reason that all that time Greek was the language of the Roman Church, and the Roman Liturgy was in Greek. But in Northern Africa Greek did not flourish. May be, the embers still glowed of the commercial feud that had gone on for centuries between Greek and Carthaginian. The surviving children of the old Phoenician city refused to speak Greek. Latin however they could not refuse: they had to hold intercourse with their Roman rulers, who could not be expected to speak Phoenician. And men from Italy came over the Mediterranean in multitudes to settle in Numidia and Mauritania. Thus the language of the Church in Africa was Latin, while it was still Greek at Rome. In course of time this African Latin Bible travelled into Italy, and from its acceptance there got the name of *Itala*; as it may possibly have had that name before, *Itala* merely meaning Latin. The age of correctors and corrupters now set in. Miscorrection put a finish and a literary gloss upon the doings of careless and ignorant transcribers. "Among the Latins," says St. Jerome, "there are as many

variant copies as there are manuscripts" *(Praef. in Josue)*; and he intimates his purpose of correcting "the mistranslations of faulty interpreters," and "the still more perverse emendations of presumptuous blockheads." The latter were men who either knowing no Greek, or, if they knew any, still wholly neglecting St. Augustine's advice to Julian, *Graecum attende codicem*, "keep your eye on the Greek original," set to work improving the Latinity of the *Itala* and altering the sense for that purpose. For the *Itala* was no model of Latin style. It was a literal word-for-word rendering into Latin of the Hebrew or Greek original, doing violence to Latin syntax for that very purpose of being exact and literal. In that, it resembled some of those word-for-word versions of classical authors, known to school-boys as 'cribs.' And this, to the scholar of to-day, makes the value of such portions of the *Itala* as are recoverable. Through their bare literalness we can read the third century Greek or Hebrew original. Of the Latinity of the *Itala* a specimen is familiar to us in the hundred-and-twenty-fifth psalm: *In convertendo Dominus captivitatem Sion.* Of corrections for the worse, made in disregard of the Greek, I seem to myself to have discovered one in our present Latin reading of Col. ii. 14: *chirographum decreti quod erat contrarium nobis*,

"the handwriting of the decree that was against us." Excellent Latin, and excellent sense! But *decreti* would be represented in Greek by τοῦ δόγματος. Now all the Greek manuscripts unite in reading τοῖς δόγμασι, which would be in Latin *decretis*. What that reading means, it is not easy, nor is it my present purpose to determine: only I believe the original reading of the *Itala* to have been *chirographum decretis*, and that some copyist, not having the reverence of Greek before his eyes, altered to the more intelligible *decreti*.

I have before me a liturgical instance. In the Epistle for Low Sunday we read correctly from I. Peter ii. 2, *sicut modo geniti infantes, rationabile sine dolo lac concupiscite*, where *rationabile lac* represents τὸ λογικὸν γάλα, and that seems to stand for τὸ γάλα τὸ τοῦ λόγου, "the milk of the word" of God. But in the Introit of that Sunday, in all the Missals that I have seen,* we read *Quasi modo geniti infantes, rationabiles*, "as new-born reasonable infants," the adjective passing from the milk to the babes themselves. This is perhaps an error of copyist rather than of corrector. But I fancy I detect a corrector's error in a prayer, used for the Collect of sundry Saints, St. Barnabas, St. George, and St. William

* A friend writes that "*rationabile* has been seen certainly in two missals."

of York. The original formula I take to have been, *ut quae ejus beneficio poscimus, dono tuae gratiae consequamur*, "that what we ask by favour of him (or "by benefit of his intercession,") we may obtain by the gift of Thy grace." Thus *Caesaris beneficio* would mean "by the favour of Caesar": *tuo beneficio*, "thanks to you." The antithesis of the two ablatives *beneficio, dono*, is quite in the style of our old Collects. But some purblind grammarian's eyes were pained by *quae ejus beneficio*, and he altered to *beneficia*. The alteration has thrown the prayer into wreck irrecoverable, except by the restitution of *beneficio*. Other futile attempts have been made; thus for St. Barnabas we read, *qui tua per eum beneficia poscimus*, and the same for St. George; but for St. William, *quae ejus beneficia poscimus*, which I take to represent the first correction.

Like fate has befallen our English Catholic Rheims version. Made by exiled Oxford scholars in 1580, this version stood to the Vulgate Latin as the *Itala* of old to the Hebrew and Greek. Rheims is very faithful, but not very English, e.g. Phil. ii. 10, "every knee bow of the celestials, terrestrials, and infernals." In II. Cor. iii. 16, the Rheims has: "when he shall be converted to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away," a correct rendering of the Latin, *cum conversus fuerit ad*

*Dominum.** But turning to our modern Douay we find, "when they shall be converted to the Lord." That *they* has no support in Latin or Greek. It is "made in England" by some cleric who should have known better. Or is it a printer's error? It looks rather like the hand of St. Jerome's *praesumptor imperitus.*

St. Jerome lived A.D. 346—420. In his time the *Itala* text was in a very bad way. His great claim to the title of Doctor of the Church is this, that, besides confronting numerous heresies, he gave to the Church a correct Latin Bible, known as the Latin Vulgate. This has to a considerable extent set aside the old *Itala*, to what extent I will now show. St. Jerome made a new translation from the Hebrew of the whole of the 'proto-canonical' books of the Old Testament, that is, the books which appear in the Anglican Authorised (King James's) Version, to the exclusion of the Apocrypha. For all the proto-canonical books then, (the Psalms excepted, as will appear presently) the Latin Vulgate represents St. Jerome's version, *not the Itala.* He also translated Tobias and Judith. For the remainder of the Apocrypha, to wit, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Maccabees, he was content

* For a full discussion of this interesting passage see my *Notes on St. Paul*, p. 160.

to correct the *Itala*. In reading them in the Vulgate we have the *Itala* in the main, but it is left to the scholar, if he can, to mark off the untouched text from St. Jerome's corrections. What holds for the Apocrypha in the Old Testament, holds for the whole of the New. Our Latin New Testament is the *Itala* with St. Jerome's corrections. St. Jerome translated the Psalms from the Hebrew. But, as is well known, in the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, the Psalms vary considerably from the Hebrew. More than any other part of the Old Testament, the Psalms were familiar to the Christian people. Now the *Itala* had taken the Psalms from the Septuagint, the *Itala* version the people sang, and it was found impossible to wean them from it. This *Itala* version of the Psalms, not St. Jerome's, is still in use for the most part in the Christian Liturgy, and the same is printed in the Latin Vulgate. St. Jerome's Bible did not come into universal use from the first. St. Isidore of Seville, writing about the year 620, says that it is "now generally adopted by all the churches."

But the same fate overtook St. Jerome's Bible that had befallen the *Itala* before his time. There came to be, in minor details of reading, not in the substance of the book, "as many versions as

manuscripts." Roger Bacon in the thirteenth century says of the Paris text, which he calls *exemplar vulgatum*, that it is "horribly corrupt"; while of the *Correctorium*, or corrected copy, which a certain Religious Order, other than his own, had made, he pronounces that "the uncorrected Paris copy is far less bad than their correction." One Correctorium however, called the Sorbonicum from being kept in the library of the Sorbonne, is a work of great merit. The first book printed was an edition of the Vulgate at Mentz in 1450. In the next fifty years nearly one hundred editions of the Vulgate came from the printing-press, most of them blindly repeating the errors of the manuscripts. There was however some attempt at improvement on the part of Cardinal Ximenes and others.

In 1546 the Council of Trent issued its famous decree:—"The Holy Synod considering that no little profit may accrue to the Church of God by its being generally understood, of all the Latin editions of the Sacred Books that are in circulation which edition is to be held as authentic, enacts and declares that this same old Vulgate edition, which has been approved by the long use of so many centuries in the Church, be held for authentic in public lectures, disputations, preachings and expositions, and that no man dare

or presume to reject it on any pretence whatsoever." The meaning of this Decree, and particularly the meaning of the word *authentic*, we will consider presently. The first step towards carrying it out, so the Council proposed, was the issuing of a correct and authorised edition of the Latin Vulgate. This proved a work of labour far greater than was anticipated. Forty years passed, and still it was not done. The masterful energy of Sixtus V., urging the scholars at his command to labour, produced at last, in 1590, what is known as the Sixtine Vulgate. But just as the work was ready Sixtus died. Upon his death complaints broke out of the haste with which the work had been done, and the inaccuracies which disfigured it in consequence. Gregory XIV. appointed a commission to correct it. When their corrections were complete, Gregory died (October, 1591). Clement VIII. in 1592, ordered further revision: finally, before the end of that year, what we now know as the Clementine Vulgate was published. It is still the classic Vulgate in use in the Catholic Church.* The scholars employed by Sixtus, Gregory, and

* The edition of 1592 still bore the name of Sixtus V. only, as also two other editions, 1593 and 1598, in which the numerous typographical errors of the 1592 edition were corrected. Clement's name was first added on the title-page to that of Sixtus in an edition published at Cologne in 1638.

Clement worked with extreme industry and sound judgment. They collated the best manuscripts, observed the Greek and Hebrew, and the quotations of the Fathers. The preface to Clement VIII.'s edition admits that not all errors, known to the editors, have been corrected. The editors probably bore in mind the story of the African bishop who, on St. Jerome's authority, read aloud in church *ivy* instead of *gourd* as the plant that sheltered Jonas (Jonas iv. 6 sq.), whereupon his people raised such a tumult that the bishop, to save his place, went back to *gourd*.* So the Clementine edition did not care to shock the faithful by too many changes. But was not this to sacrifice the truth of faith to popular clamour? No, the corrections in question did not involve matters of faith. The Clementine and Sixtine Vulgate, as it stands, is a safe guide of faith. And this brings me to the explanation of what the Council of Trent meant by declaring the Vulgate *authentic*.

There were in the seventeenth century theologians in Spain who held, not, it seems, without some pressure from the Inquisition, that the Vulgate was declared by the Council to be in all respects a faithful copy of the Word of God as originally inspired,—never therefore to be de-

* *Gourd* is the Septuagint reading.

parted from in any particular, under any pretext of Hebrew readings or superior Greek manuscripts. No one holds that opinion now. And it was contradicted from the first by the theologians who were present at the Council. Out of several, it will be sufficient to quote the Franciscan, Andrew Vega (*De justificatione*, xv. 9, Alcala, 1564):—"The Synod did not approve the mistakes, which scholars even moderately versed in Holy Writ detect in the Vulgate [as it stood before the Sixtine and Clementine corrections]. Nor did the Council wish the Vulgate to be adored as though it had fallen from heaven. The Council knew that the translator of the Vulgate, whoever he was, was no prophet, and that we have not deserved hitherto to find a translator to translate the Scriptures with the same inspiration wherewith the original was written. Consequently the Council neither laid nor wished to lay restraint upon the industry of linguistic scholars, who sometimes evince that some passages might have been better translated. . . . But in recognition of its antiquity, and the honour which Latin Councils have for many years paid to it, and to let the faithful know for certain that which is most true, namely, that no pernicious error can be got out of the Vulgate, and that it may be read safely and without

danger; as also to check the confusion ensuing upon the multitude of translations, and chasten the excessive licence of for ever printing new translations, the Synod wisely enacted that we should use the Vulgate in public lectures, disputations, and expositions. And the Synod so far wished it to be held authentic as that all should for certain know that it was not defiled by any error from which any pernicious doctrine in faith or morals could be gathered: hence the enactment that no one should dare to reject it on any pretext. And that this was the mind of the Council, and that it had no intention of enacting anything further, you may gather from the words themselves." He adds that Cardinal Cervini, afterwards Marcellus II., who presided over the Council, assured him that nothing further was intended. Vega goes on to assure Calvin: "therefore neither you, nor any one else is debarred by this approval of the Vulgate edition from recurring to the original sources [i.e. the Greek and Hebrew], wherever you have a difficulty, and thence alleging anything you can find for the aid and enrichment of Latin readers, for the emendation of the Vulgate text, and the attainment of readings better in keeping with the mind of the Holy Ghost and the original text." Indeed, when this decree of Trent was brought

to Rome, the Roman theologians made a difficulty over the wording of it, on the ground of notorious mistakes in the then Vulgate text. To this the Papal Legates, presiding at the Council, replied that the existence of such mistakes was quite recognised at Trent, but not on that account had the Fathers wished to pronounce the Vulgate a mistaken version on the whole. This shows how far it was from their minds to pronounce it absolutely and in all things accurate.

The declaration is well explained by Father Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, p. 158. "This declaration of the Council is often misunderstood. It does not imply the entire conformity of the Vulgate to the originals; and it is perfectly allowable to suppose that the translator was mislead by false readings in the manuscript that he used, or that he mistook the sense of what was before him. The work of critically settling the text, and of interpretation, is not interfered with by the Decree: as a matter of fact, the critical value of the Vulgate stands high, but it is not conclusive. But the meaning of the declaration is this: that in an argument upon a question of faith and morals there is no appeal from the authority of the Vulgate; whatever propositions, in these spheres, follow from the Vulgate, are undoubtedly true. It may be

that the corresponding passages in the originals did not yield the same sense, ... but it will never be shown that the teaching of the Vulgate on faith and morals is in conflict with what we know on the subject from the originals, or from other sources of knowledge of Divine truth." To this we should add that, by the declaration of the Council, not only does the Vulgate afford no handle to dogmatic or moral error, but also, in the main, the said Vulgate does well and faithfully convey that body of divinely revealed truth which it has been the good pleasure of God to deposit in His written Word.

The examples of textual criticism that I shall presently give will serve to illustrate this interpretation of the Tridentine Decree. Meanwhile I wish to forestall a mistaken notion that might arise in the minds of my hearers from what I have already said. Some of you may have taken the impression that translations of the Scriptures into English, or any living language, are quite unreliable; that consequently the Bible is a sealed book to those who do not read Hebrew and Greek, or at least Latin; that the written word of God is not in your hands at all. That is not true, and I have never said so. All that I have said is that the translation does not,

cannot, give the sense so well as the original: still it does give the sense fairly well in the main. In it you find current coin, a little worn and defaced, still good enough to pass. The translation does not cease to be good by the fact that the original is better. We will lay hold of the better, so far as we can grasp it; but where the better is out of our reach, we will rest content with that which is simply good and sufficient. So we will continue to read thankfully our English Bible.

But there is another point to note. It is not the intention of God that Christians generally should gather their religious instruction for themselves at first hand from the Bible. The 'open Bible,' the Bible open to all comers to make what they can out of the reading of it, that is a Protestant idea, it is not the way of the Catholic Church. *Trowest thou that thou understandest the things which thou readest?* So Philip the Deacon demanded of the eunuch whom he found reading Isaias. The man well answered: *And how can I, unless some man show me? And Philip opening his mouth, and beginning from this Scripture, evangelised to him Jesus.** The Bible is a hard book, and needs explanation: it is the intention

* Acts viii. 30—35, original Rheims version.

of Christ that His faithful should have the Bible explained to them by the infallible voice of His Church, and so should know their religion, not so much by reading as by hearing. *Faith is by hearing* (Rom. x. 17). The Church is continually teaching the people, not, certainly, all the mysteries contained in the Bible,—for that divine Book contains many mysterious narratives and prophecies which shall not stand clear to our eyes till the day of judgment,—but such portions as we need to know in order to work out our salvation. Away from Church guidance, the Bible is positively a dangerous book: it has done harm, and it is doing harm still, to many self-opinionated readers. In the epistles of *our most dear brother Paul are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable deprave, as also the rest of the Scriptures, to their own perdition* (II. Pet. iii. 16). The infallible Bible should be read under the guidance of the infallible Church.

Infallibility in the Church does not dispense with learning: what it does is to prevent learning from drawing false conclusions and uttering false doctrines in certain solemn occasions when the whole Church is addressed by those who preside over it. Officially, the Pope is 'assisted' by the Holy Spirit, not inspired: that is to say, he is not endowed with knowledge infused into his

mind by divine communication: he has to learn his theology as other men learn theirs, by study and conversation with the learned; but God takes care of him that he shall not misuse his theology authoritatively to mislead the Church. As the Pope is not inspired, neither is the parish priest, no, nor even the curate. The Bible is for both clergy and laity, but rather for the clergy,—or, I should say, for the laity ordinarily through the clergy. The priest should use the Bible in teaching the people. He should explain Holy Writ to them. Not having, as I have said he has not, any intelligence of the Scriptures by inspiration from heaven, there is nothing left for the rector and for the curate to do but to study the Scriptures. First they must study, and so teach. They must study continually, so long as they continue to teach. They must not copy the notable example of Fray Gerundio, who "gives over his studies and takes to preaching." They must study Scripture primarily in the Latin Vulgate. No translation into the vernacular of any language enjoys the authority which the Catholic Church gives to the Vulgate Latin. Every priest must know Latin. Not every priest need know Hebrew, nor even Greek. He is safe in expounding to his flock the meaning which he legitimately draws from the Vulgate

Latin. Thus, finding in Isaias xvi. 1, *Emitte Agnum, Domine, dominatorem terrae de petra deserti ad montem filiae Sion*, and not knowing that the Hebrew gives quite another sense,* he delivers a homily on 'Christ foretold in Scripture,' how our Lord was shown forth as the Lamb of God, mild as a lamb, offered a victim as a lamb, and yet for all that one who was to come to hold dominion over the whole earth. The matter of such a discourse would be excellent, wholesome and orthodox doctrine, not found indeed (on critical grounds) in that particular verse of Isaias, but certainly to be found elsewhere in that same prophet and in other testimonies of the Old Law. This preacher is safe with the Vulgate, and the Vulgate only. He is a good man in his place. But it is desirable that there should be in other places of the Church men more erudite than he, who will check the Vulgate of the Old Testament by the Hebrew, and of the New Testament by the Greek original. Not only will these more erudite clerics make a better stand in controversy with an opponent: they will also

* See Knabenbauer, S. J., on Isaias, pp. 343—346. The Hebrew, as St. Jerome was not unaware, runs: "send forth the lamb of the ruler of the earth from Sela towards the desert to the mountain of the daughter of Sion": which means, "let the ruler of the land of Moab send from his city of Sela, or Petra, by way of the desert his tribute of sheep to Jerusalem."

at times see more meaning in the Vulgate than the mere Latin could have shown. Here is the Vulgate Latin of Philippians ii. 9—11: *Propter quod et Deus exaltavit illum, et donavit illi nomen, quod est super omne nomen, ut in nomine Jesu omne genu flectatur, . . . et omnis lingua confiteatur quia Dominus Jesus Christus in gloria est Dei Patris.* Which Latin is accurately rendered in the Rheims version: "For the which thing God also hath exalted him, and hath given him a name which is above all names, that in the name of Jesus every knee bow, ... and every tongue confess that our Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father." The Greek has: "Wherefore God also hath eminently exalted (ὑπερύψωσεν) him, and hath given him the name (τὸ ὄνομα) that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee bow, ... and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father, (ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ Πατρός)." So the Anglican Revised Version, correctly. To bring the Latin into conformity with the Greek, all that is required is to read *in gloriam* for *in gloria*, and to omit the copula *est*. I feel convinced that the reading of the original *Itala* stood thus, *confiteatur quia Dominus Jesus Christus in gloriam Dei Patris.* Then it would be what the *Itala* regularly was,

an exact word-for-word rendering of the Greek into Latin, regardless often of Latin idiom. The Greek idiom, involved in the passage, being the key to the right understanding of it, is simply this. As we say, in rhetorical and poetical passages, such things as 'happy the hour,' 'high the expectations,' so the Greeks habitually spoke, getting rid of the copula *is*, and marking the adjective as predicate (not epithet) by putting it first, followed by the definite article, and finally the substantive. The article is sometimes omitted. Thus, what the excited multitude at Ephesus cried for the space of two hours,—in Greek, be observed, as Ephesus was a Greek city, —was exactly, "Great the Diana of Ephesians," μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις, (Acts xix., 28), which our versions very properly render in our idiom, "Great is Diana." Remembering this, we easily understand, what might otherwise have made a difficulty in St. Paul's saying (I. Cor. xii. 3), *Nemo potest dicere, Dominus Jesus, nisi in Spiritu Sancto*, rightly rendered in the Revised Version, "No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Ghost,"—less well rendered by Rheims, "our Lord Jesus." *Dominus* is predicate. The text means, as will presently appear, "No one, without the aid of grace, can confess and believe that Jesus is Lord God." Similarly, in our text

from Philippians, *Dominus Jesus Christus*, the *Dominus* is predicate, "Jesus Christ is Lord." *The Lord Jesus Christ* is a mistranslation, converting predicate into epithet, in ignorance of the Greek idiom. Here is a capital instance of men reading the Vulgate Latin wrong, because they do not know, or do not attend to the Greek. But how about the copula *est?* That *est* is an interpolation, the work of what St. Jerome calls "a wrong-headed corrector." If *est* is to be put in, it should appear thus, *Jesus Christus est Dominus*, which the Greek means. Finally, the *in gloria* is part of the same corruption: εἰς δόξαν can only be *in gloriam.* All old manuscripts, to save paper and time, are written in abbreviations, often intricate enough, the study of which intricacies is called the science of Palaeography. The simplest of these abbreviations consists in representing a final *m* by a little curved line over the last vowel; this the more readily as syllables so ending in *m* were habitually slurred over in Roman speech, when the next word opened with a vowel. Thus *in gloriam* of the original *Itala* would have been written *in gloriā*: nothing was easier to a careless transcriber than to omit this mark of abbreviation: whereupon the reading became *in gloria.*

A deep interest attaches to this particular text,

inasmuch as, rightly understood, it furnishes (I think) the strongest testimony of any single text of Scripture to the Divinity of Christ. To gather the full force of the text, we need to recur to the previous verse: "God gave him the name that is above every name." St. Paul, we must remember, was a Jew, and wrote Greek with the mind of a Jew. Now, in Hebrew, 'to have a name' is a circumlocution for 'to be'; and 'to give a name' is 'to render,' 'to make.' Thus in the famous prophecy of Isaias ix., we have these words: "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God," that is to say, the Child in question shall be all these things. To 'give the name,' then, is to 'work the reality.' Next, we ask the Apostle, as a Jew, to tell us, what is "the name which is above every name." To a Jew, only one answer is possible. It is the Incommunicable Name of *four letters*, i.e. four Hebrew consonants, (called therefore the *Tetragrammaton*), the awful Name which no Hebrew dared pronounce, it is the name of the God of Israel, *Jehovah*, or *Jahveh*, the name by which God announced Himself to Moses in the burning bush (Exod. iii. 13—15), and which is taken to mean, *He who is*. It is the equivalent of this Name, proper and peculiar to the God of Israel, that is given to Jesus Christ by His Father.

In other words, Jesus Christ is recognised by His Father to be Himself the God of Israel, one God with the Father, sharing His Father's right to the Incommunicable Name. As I have said, the Jews never pronounced that Name, so that in time even the secret of its pronunciation was lost. Instead of it they used *Adonai* meaning *Lord*. "Every tongue," says St. Paul, shall "confess that Jesus Christ is Lord," i.e. is Adonai: but that confession brings back once more the assurance that Jesus Christ is Jahveh Himself.

All this grand witness to the Divinity of Christ you may read in the Latin Vulgate as it stands, you may read it in your English version, but how much more pregnant and significative does it become by reference to the original Greek!

In the above passage from Philippians, the Vulgate text falls short of the original. In the passage I now come to, the present Vulgate contains a downright, manifest error and discrepancy from the Greek, an error, I am apt to think, which has crept in by corruption of St. Jerome's text and will be removed by the Benedictine Editors. Colossians ii. 11, is thus rendered in the Anglican Revised Version, conformably to the undoubted Greek text: "in whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not

made by hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ." The original Rheims has: "in whom all you are circumcised with circumcision not made by hand,* in spoiling of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ." Hence we gather that those Rheims scholars read their Vulgate thus: *in quo omnes circumcisi estis circumcisione non manu facta, in exspoliatione corporis carnis, in circumcisione Christi.* Except for the unimportant addition of *omnes*, this Latin and the Rheims rendering of it is in perfect accord with the Revised Version, and with the Greek as it came from the hand of St. Paul. And the sense is clear. Baptism is called "a circumcision not-made-with-hands," that is a spiritual circumcision, marked off from the carnal Jewish rite, which was a χειρουργία, or *surgical* (old English *chirurgical*) operation, done with hands upon the flesh. In the Greek, *not-made-with-hands* is one word ἀχειροποίητος, being the privative of χειροποίητος, *made-with-hands*, which was the usual Jewish word descriptive of the idols of the nations, marking them off from the spiritual, uncreated God of Israel. Thus Isaias xxxvii., 19; *And they cast their idols into the fire, for*

* I have ventured to supply a comma here.

they were not gods, but works of the hands of men. The words χειροποίητος and ἀχειροποίητος came to answer to our philosophical terms *material* and *spiritual.* Thus we have in Daniel ii. 34, *a stone rent off from the mountain without hands,* i.e. by a spiritual operation. In Acts vii. 48: xvii. 24, God is declared by St. Stephen and St. Paul not to *dwell in houses made by hands.* In Hebrews ix. 11, we read of *a more perfect tabernacle, not made by hands* (οὐ χειροποίητον), *that is, not of this* (material) *creation.* Lastly in Mark xiv. 58, Our Lord is accused of saying: *I will dissolve this temple made with hands* (χειροποίητον), *and in three days will I build another not made with hands* (ἀχειροποίητον), which is explained by John ii. 19, 21, *but he spoke of the temple of his body.* Baptism then is a spiritual circumcision. Being a *circumcision* it must be the taking of something away: being *spiritual,* it must take away spiritually, not physically. What does it take away? That is explained in the next clause. Our spiritual circumcision consists in a *spoiling* (or *putting off*) *of the body of the flesh.* No reader of St. Paul can mistake what *the body of the flesh is.* The process of its putting off is described in the next chapter (Col. iii. 9), *spoiling yourselves of the old man with his acts, and doing on the new.* And this is said to be the

work of baptism, that *our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, that we may serve sin no longer* (Rom. vi. 6). The *body of the flesh* is the *old man with his acts,* it is the *body of sin* : that is put off in baptism. So finally in this verse baptism is pronounced to be *the circumcision of Christ,* or Christian circumcision.

Unhappily, one day there sat down with the Vulgate Latin before him a scribe innocent of Greek, having no idea that *not-made-with-hands* is one compound word. He took the *not* out of composition, and applied it to the whole phrase *manu facta in exspoliatione corporis carnis.* Thus, while St. Paul says that baptism is a *spoiling of the body of the flesh,* this scribe made him say that it is *not* a spoiling of the body of the flesh, . . . *but* something else. How durst he, we may ask, bring the passage into conflict with such plain texts as those we have quoted, Romans vi. 6, and Col. iii. 9 ? To avoid such conflict, the unhappy scribe was obliged to give a new meaning to *body of the flesh,* and make it mean *the part removed by circumcision,* a meaning wholly unauthorised in Pauline phraseology. Then the balance of the sentence was upset : to restore it, this ingenious person, having not any respect for Greek before his eyes, intro-

duced of his own the conjunction *sed* (but). So the Vulgate now runs: *circumcisi estis circumcisione non manu facta in exspoliatione corporis carnis, sed in circumcisione Christi.* There is one simple remedy: cast out that peccant *sed.*

The next passage that comes under our notice furnishes the most ancient, the most famous, the most singular, the gravest and widest of all the divergences that obtain between the Latin and the Greek, the Latin Vulgate and the Latin Fathers for the most part supporting one reading, and the Greek Fathers and most authentic Greek manuscripts exhibiting another. I open the Revised Version at I. Cor. xv. 51, and read: *We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.* Turning to the Rheims version, I find: *We shall all indeed rise again, but we shall not all be changed.* Here indeed is divergence, nay, apparently, opposition and contradiction. The Revised Version says, *We shall not all sleep,* referring to the sleep of death, i.e. *We shall not all die.* Rheims says, *We shall all rise again,* implying that we shall all die. According to the Revised Version, *we shall all be changed.* According to Rheims, *we shall not all be changed.* Yet, two lines below, the Revised Version and Rheims unite in affirming, *we shall be changed.* The Revised Version is founded on the reading of

the Vatican manuscript, *πάντες οὐ κοιμησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.* The Rheims represents the Vulgate, *omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur.*

The former contradiction is not easy to explain away, the latter is easily dissolved. Let us dispose of the latter, and have it out of the way. The two *we*'s then, the Latin *we* and the Greek *we* of verse 51, do not refer to the same set of persons. The *we* of the Latin has a far wider extension than the *we* of the Greek. In the Latin of verse 51, the pronoun is taken to refer to the whole multitude of mankind: in the Greek, it refers to the select body of faithful followers of Christ whom He finds on earth when He comes in judgment. The *change* is that change spoken of in verse 53, *this mortal body must put on* (a glorious) *immortality*. Not the whole multitude of mankind shall put on a glorious immortality: there shall be *resurrection* also *of the unjust* (Acts, xxiv. 15), and their immortality shall not be glorious. That is what the Latin declares, and the Greek does not deny. When both unite in saying, *we shall be changed* (verse 53), the *we* that they both have in mind is the multitude of faithful Christians found alive at the Day of Judgment. They shall pass in one hour from their mortal state

to immortality: that is the meaning of being *changed*. There is no real contradiction here between Latin and Greek.

To return to the opening words of verse 51, *πάντες οὐ κοιμησόμεθα, we shall not all die,* as opposed to *omnes resurgemus, we shall all rise again* (from death). Taken in isolation, away from context, away from history and tradition, and away from parallel passages of St. Paul elsewhere bearing on the same subject, the Greek and Latin texts here might seem to be flat contradiction, so that, if the Greek be the true reading, then the Vulgate contradicts what the inspired Apostle wrote. So it might seem to the superficial reader. But the Church in pronouncing the Vulgate "authentic," never warranted such wilful and perverse wrenching of isolated phrases. Looking at the context, we see that in the succeeding verses, 52, 53, *we,* faithful found alive at the Judgment Day, are marked off from the *dead* with such emphasis as to *suggest* at least that *we* shall not die, but be *changed* to immortality without passing through death. Looking at the history of the text, and the tradition of the Fathers about it, we find the Greek Fathers to a man ignoring the *omnes resurgemus;* and St. Jerome himself (on Isaias xli. 6) quoting the Vatican Greek reading as genuine,

while he also admits that it stood formerly in many Latin versions: the true reading then is marked by tradition as doubtful. Looking at parallel Pauline texts, we find St. Paul (II. Cor. v. 4) speaking of our hope to be, not *unclothed*, (i.e. having our souls parted from our bodies), but *overclothed* (Rheims), or *clothed upon* (Revised Version), *that what is mortal may be swallowed up in life.* The text of I. Thess. iv. 15, 16, 17; *we which live, which are remaining in the advent of our Lord, shall not prevent* [have the start of] *them that have slept: . . . . the dead that are in Christ shall rise again first; then we that live, that are left, withal shall be taken up with them in the clouds to meet Christ:*—this text, I say, is so clear that the chief of Latin Doctors, St. Augustine, writes (*ad Dulcitium*) "Really the Apostle seems to assert that at the end of the world sundry persons shall not die, but, being found alive, shall suddenly be changed to that immortality which is given to the rest of the Saints, and shall be caught up with them, as he says, in the clouds. Nor have I ever come to any other conclusion, as often as I have set my mind to think of these words." St. Augustine, oddly enough, was ignorant of the Greek reading of I. Cor. xv. 51, and his adherence to the *omnes resurgemus* carried the Latin world with him. Yet it was felt that it would not do

to set the First of Corinthians against the Second, and against the First of Thessalonians. Therefore it was conjectured that the faithful, alive at the Second Coming, would instantly die and instantly rise again. There is high authority for that conjecture: nevertheless, on the ground that I am about to take up, it will appear gratuitous and unnecessary, quite an otiose hypothesis.

I have thought of another mode of conciliation between the Latin and the Greek. What if *omnes quidem resurgemus* (*πάντες μὲν ἀναστησόμεθα* of the Codex Claramontanus at Paris) meant, 'we shall all be *sons of the resurrection*' (Luke xx. 36), i.e. 'all the elect shall enter on to a state in which they shall *die no more* (cf. Luke l.c.), but only those whom the Judge finds alive shall pass to immortality without death? This idea, however, in the humble judgment of its originator, is more ingenious than true. It may be noticed that throughout this chapter (I. Cor. xv.), and everywhere in the New Testament, except I. Thess. iv. 14: Acts xvii. 3, the verb for to *rise again* from the dead is *ἐγείρεσθαι*, not *ἀνίστασθαι*.

I have already said enough to make it plain to you all that I consider the *omnes resurgemus* of the Vulgate to be a deviation from what St. Paul wrote, and that the Apostle's original utterance

is preserved to us in the Greek text of the Vatican manuscript, *πάντες οὐ κοιμησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα,* aptly enough rendered by the Anglican Revisors, *we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,* or, more aptly and more literally still, *we shall all, not sleep, but we shall all, I say, be changed.* It is to be noticed that *all* and *all* here are the same persons, namely, the faithful found alive at the Day of Judgment: there is no antithesis: the *πάντες μὲν . . . πάντες δὲ* of the Received Text (as it is called) does not represent the Vatican manuscript, and the *μὲν* is cast out now unanimously by scholars.*

In point of manuscript authority, it must be confessed that there are two Greek readings, that already given from the Vatican manuscript, and a curious variant, supported by the high authority of the Sinaitic manuscript, and (doubtfully) by some authors: it is *πάντες μὲν κοιμησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα;* "we shall all sleep, but we shall not all be changed." The

* I have not receded from the position which I took up twenty years ago, in my *Notes on St. Paul*, pp. 130—134: in which I was inspired by Father Cornely, S.J., *Cursus S. Scripturae, Prima ad Corinthios*, p.p. 506—512. To those pages I refer my reader. To the same effect writes Père Prat, S.J., *La Theologie de St. Paul*, I. 193. Personally, I am not acquainted with any modern scholar who still supports *omnes quidem resurgemus*. Westcott and Hort do not even mention the reading. Unbroken is the silence of the Greek Fathers.

objections to this reading are, first, that the mass of documentary evidence is against it; secondly, that it makes nonsense: for surely it is nonsense to say, "when the last trumpet soundeth, though we shall all die, we shall not all be changed, or pass straight from mortality to immortality," which is the meaning of 'changed' in this passage. The reading looks like a clerical error, perpetrated by some scribe who, seeing that he had omitted the negative *οὐ* before *κοιμησόμεθα*, supplied it by mistake *after*, instead of *before* that verb. The reading of the Vatican manuscript is the regular established Greek reading, supported all but unanimously by the Greek Fathers.

Then as regards context, to make the Apostle say, "though we shall all rise again, yet we shall not all be changed to a glorious immortality,"—for so the Vulgate is commonly interpreted,* brings the wicked, the reprobate, into the discourse: now, nowhere in this chapter are the reprobate in any way referred to: the Apostle speaks continuously only of the elect, them that *sleep in Christ* (ver. 18), having died before His coming in judgment on the one hand,—they shall *rise again*; and them on the other hand that, being alive at the Day of Judgment, shall be

* E.g. by A Lapide.

changed, i.e. shall put on immortality over their mortal bodies (ver. 53). The more one reads verses 50—54 together, the more one feels that the Latin *omnes quidem resurgemus* dislocates the whole passage. It forces us to give to *changed* in verse 51 a wider extension and a narrower signification than it bears in verse 52: for in the former verse, in the Latin interpretation, all the elect are spoken of as *changed*, meaning no more than that their bodies are glorified; while in the latter verse the *changed* are distinguished from the dead saints who rise again to incorruption, and they are said to be *changed*, not simply because their bodies are glorified, but because their living *mortal* bodies have *put on immortality* (verse 53).

Writing on quite another text, Rom. ii. 7, St. John Chrysostom, oddly enough, gives a perfect paraphrase of this I. Cor. xv. 51, as it stands in the Vulgate, to which text however he makes no reference. *πάντες μὲν γάρ ἀναστησόμεθα ἄφθαρτοι, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες εἰς δόξαν, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν εἰς κόλασιν, οἱ δὲ εἰς ζωὴν*; "we shall all rise again incorrupt, but not all to glory, but some to punishment, some to life (Hom. 6 on Romans). But coming to the text (Hom. 42 on I. Cor.), he quotes it according to the Received Greek Text, which accords with the Vatican reading

except for πάντες μὲν: whereupon all his comment is this: "The meaning of the text is this: true, we shall not all die, but we shall all be changed, even they that do not die, for they too are mortal. Do not you then, seeing that you die, be therefore afraid as though you were not to rise again: for there are some, there are some, who shall even escape death: nevertheless that is not enough for them in view of that resurrection, but those bodies too that die not must be changed and altered to immortality." Thus St. Chrysostom is wholly at one with the interpretation which I have given, and ignores the Latin reading.

It remains to conjecture how this extraordinary variant reading, which the Vulgate preserves, can possibly have arisen. I trace it to a primitive corruption of the *Itala* text, as early at least as the time of Tertullian, who lived at the close of the second century, and reads *omnes quidem resurgemus*, etc. The original translator, who made the *Itala* version, literal and faithful as ever to the Greek text, finding οὐ κοιμησόμεθα, rendered it *non dormiemus*. So far, so good. But an evil genius of a scribe, an African regardless of Greek, committed the reverse error to that which I have noted on Colossians, ii. 11. That is to say, he took the negative and merged it in the verb, and read it in this sense, *we shall all not-sleep*, i.e. 'we

shall awake,' 'we shall sleep no longer.' But to awake from the sleep of death is to rise again: accordingly this man took Holy Scripture into his own hands, and boldly wrote *omnes resurgemus.* The next step (analogous to the insertion of *sed* in the text of Colossians) was to provide an antithesis by prefixing a negative to the original *omnes immutabimur.* So it may have been, but the certain origin of the corruption remains a mystery. As I have suggested elsewhere *(Notes on St. Paul*, p. 132*)*, the Sinaitic reading may have had something to do with it.

Thus the study of the Greek text does not always result in the vindication of the present Vulgate Latin.* Some of our forefathers in religion were too sanguine in expecting to do that. But this I can say, from a careful collation of the Vulgate Latin with the Greek of two Gospels and seven of St. Paul's Epistles, that such attention to the Greek text does greatly enhance one's esteem for the Vulgate, and does frequently vindicate its accuracy, sometimes as

* I have defended the present Vulgate, or tried to recover what I take to have been the original Vulgate reading in Matt. xv. 5, 6: John iii. 3, 8: v. 4: viii. 1—11, 25: x. 29: xvii. 11: I. Cor. iii. 4: viii. 7: ix. 5: xiii. 4, 5. xv. 23, 49: II. Cor. iii. 16: iv. 6: viii. 8: xiii. 2: Gal. iv. 13, 25, 31: Rom. v. 1: ix. 5, 10, 22: Philip. i. 16, 17: ii. 23: Col. ii. 11, 14. See my *Gospels for Catholic Schools*, Matthew and John: also my *Notes on St. Paul*, (Burns and Oates): *Further Notes on St. Paul* (in preparation).

the Latin text now stands, and sometimes as we may fairly argue it once to have stood, ere those corruptions came in which our Benedictine Editors, under Papal instruction, are now labouring to clear away.

But, it will be said, investigations such as the specimens above given, are for the retired student; they are carried on in the shade of academic groves: they can find no place in the presbytery of the missionary priest, hard at work amid the dust and grime of a large town, and the coming and going of 'much people.' I might raise the question whether even such a priest would not be better in spirit and mind and temper, if once in a fortnight he could snatch an hour or two for these academic investigations, But the circumstances of priests on the mission vary considerably. There are not a few rectors of Sleepy Hollows, who might say with the Prometheus of Aeschylus, chained to his rock;

> Leisure? aye leisure, more than I would of leisure I find.

And it is desirable that the busiest priest should be one who *has studied*. Severe and earnest study in early life is a safe-guard in later years against the utterance of many rash and foolish things. A Clerical Seminary is a place of study. The hard student usually makes the

zealous missioner. Among the studies of the Seminary course, the study of Holy Scripture holds a primary rank. *Presbyterum oportet praedicare*, "a priest is made to preach," says the Roman Pontifical in the Ordination of Priests. He is made to preach the Word of God, and the Word of God is Holy Scripture, as borne out by Catholic tradition and interpreted by the living voice of the Church. A man may be very fluent in the pulpit, and yet not preach the Word of God. Of this there are many instances, many outside the Church, and some, not perhaps an inconsiderable number, within the fold. The laity sometimes complain that their pastor's sermons, earnest enough to be sure, are made up of nothing but scolding and begging. It is true that St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, *Now concerning the collection* (I. Cor. xvi. 1), and of his second Epistle to the Corinthians two whole chapters (viii., ix.) are taken up with begging, but in that talk of the collection how much spiritual instruction is intermingled! The laity may well complain, if, for an Easter Sunday sermon, they are treated to a discourse on the prospects of the spring, such as might have made a leader for *The Daily Telegraph*. Such discourses miss the whole end of Christian preaching in that they are not tinged with the supernatural. By

the supernatural is understood life everlasting in the vision of God, and all the means of grace, such as faith, hope, charity, prayer, the Church, the Sacraments, the mysteries of Christ's Life, Death and Resurrection, which lead up to that end of beatific vision. Now the supernatural book is the Bible, particularly the New Testament, for which the Old Testament is preparation. Therein the treasures of the supernatural, *the riches of Christ* (Eph. iii. 8) are stored. A preacher, in whose eloquence little of the supernatural order finds place, is a mere ecclesiastical wind-bag. But there is danger of the supernatural being neglected when Holy Scripture enters little or not at all into the discourse. There is danger of mere earthly virtue, benevolence and decency being inculcated, and mere earthly motives proposed. Not that such virtue is not an excellent thing of itself, but of itself it leads not to the Kingdom of Heaven, nor is the Church founded formally and precisely for the teaching of that virtue. It is the virtue of this world, and has its reward here. I think I may say, every great Christian preacher, whose name and works have lived through the ages, has been a man saturated with Scripture, and teeming with Holy Writ in all his discourses. I have in mind particularly St. John Chrysostom and St. Bernard.

In my own humble experience I seem to myself never to have preached so well as when I have explained minutely some parable or discourse of Our Lord, or a continuous passage of St. Paul. Other things being equal, it is true to say, the better preacher, the better priest; and again on the same condition, the better Scripture scholar, the better preacher. But the idea of being a Scripture scholar, and reading nothing but English, is simply ludicrous.

'What about John Bunyan?' you, a Midland audience, may well ask: honest John, who, quoting in one place the words *de corpore et sanguine Christi*, adds, "the Latin I borrow": John Bunyan, so "saturated with Scripture," to repeat my phrase expressive of what I require in a preacher. I reply: of course a man who reads the Scriptures in English, and meditates them day and night, as Bunyan did, may well know his Bible better than another, who reads the sacred volume but occasionally, though he do it in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Latin was out of John Bunyan's reach, Greek out of the reach of St. Bernard. They made the best of all that they had to hand, the one of the Latin Vulgate, the other of King James's Bible. Had further access to the Languages of the Cross been open to them, they in their zeal for the written word

were not the men to have neglected it. Bunyan in particular, had he read the Greek, or the Vulgate Latin faithful to the Greek, might have escaped the misery which that text of Thessalonians worked in his soul: *God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie* (II. Thess. ii. 11). He would have found out that *strong delusion* is a mistranslation, redolent of the Calvinism of the early Jacobean divines.* To acquiesce in the knowledge of an illiterate man like Bunyan, when you might have the knowledge of a scholar, does not argue a very profound devotion to Holy Scripture.

The supernatural instruction of our people in this age and country is a very serious need. In Catholic times Englishmen were ruled spiritually by Church and Bible. Then came the Reformation: the Church went under to the State, and the Bible, the Bible only, became the religion of Protestants. Now our countrymen generally are ruled neither by Church nor Bible. Every one invents for himself a course and rule of life, and every jack sets up to teach his neighbours.

* The Revised Version has, *God sendeth them a working of error that they should believe a lie.* The *working of error* is the working of false miracles, *the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders*, which we are to expect in the days of Antichrist. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 24: Apoc. xiii. 13—15.

Catholics mix with the world, hear all this babel of free thought, and of course are affected by it. Novels affect them, newspapers affect them, the talk of the dinner-table affect them. The voice of the world around is at best but the voice of Mr. Worldly Wiseman, preaching such virtue as shall do well for this life. Often it is not so good as that, and Mr. Worldly Wiseman gives place to Mrs. Egregious Folly. The Church's children need more than ever to be steadied by the supernatural voice of their Spiritual Mother. It is the preacher's concern, and a charge upon his conscience, that they shall hear that voice, their Mother's voice, the Church's voice, speaking the *mind of Christ* (I. Cor. ii. 16), as often as he goes up into the pulpit. That will be so indeed, if his speech be pregnant with passages of Scripture, aptly selected, deeply pondered, rightly understood, and lucidly explained.

In the fourth and fifth centuries, as the Homilies of St. John Chrysostom show, it was the custom to explain the Holy Scriptures from the pulpit, book by book, consecutively to the people. We still possess St. Chrysostom's explanations, thus delivered, of St. Matthew's and St. John's Gospel, the Acts, all St. Paul's Epistles, the Psalms, and Genesis. In each Homily a certain amount of text is explained,

and at the end comes an *Ethicon*, or Moral Instruction, often but slightly connected with what has gone before. At Rome in the Gesu, and, for all I know, in other churches, there was, till recent years, an institution called the Scripture Lecture. I wonder when anything of the sort will be possible in England, let us say, in Westminster Cathedral, or in some large church in Manchester or Liverpool. It would be desirable for the congregation to have the Sacred Text in their hands during the discourse. It would be desirable, no doubt, if they had Westcott and Hort's, or Nestle's Greek Testament, or even the Latin Vulgate in hand; but, as that is out of the question for most of them, the sixpenny English New Testament, published by Messrs. Burns and Oates, if every auditor came provided with a copy, would meet our requirements sufficiently. Of the Old Testament little would be available except the Psalms. In a country mission in Lancashire the priest told me he had served out to each of his school-children the Gospel of St. Luke, published at a penny by the Catholic Truth Society; he and they had worked through the whole of the sacred narrative to their great mutual consolation: the children were delighted with the lesson. A good augury of what might be done in a church with the

Scripture Lecture! The Lecturer should make the Greek and Latin his own and out of that erudition enrich the poverty of the vernacular and convey the full meaning to his audience. And thus much of Holy Scripture.

Turning to Liturgy, I find a notion hovering on the horizon of thought, a pestilent notion I call it, to the effect that the Latin Liturgy is for the Clergy, Popular Devotions and Popular Hymns in the vernacular for the Laity. To dispel this notion, let me bring forward the decree of the Council of Trent, concerning the greatest of Liturgical acts, the Mass.

> Though the Mass contains great matter of instruction for the faithful people, still it has not appeared expedient to the Fathers to have it celebrated everywhere in the vulgar tongue. Wherefore there is to be retained everywhere the ancient rite of each church, approved by the Holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches. At the same time, that the sheep of Christ may not hunger, nor the children ask for bread and there be none to break it to them, the Holy Synod commands pastors and all who have cure of souls frequently during the celebration of Mass, themselves or by the ministry of others, to explain some of the things that are read at Mass, and among other things to declare something of the mystery of this holy Sacrifice. (Sess. 22, cap. 8).

The fact of the universal diffusion of prayer-books, containing the Ordinary of the Mass in

Latin and English, may be said to have rendered this instruction less necessary. Can it be said wholly to have superseded it? How many of our lay-folk understand the Mass? How many assist at it dreamily, looking like sheep in a pen, with no sign of active participation in what the priest at the altar calls "my and your sacrifice"! We lament the missing of Mass in our large towns. What wonder if people miss what is so imperfectly brought home to them and what they have no enthusiasm to hear! One way or another, it is the mind of the Council of Trent, that the more the people can enter into the Latin of the Mass, the better. Hence one gladly welcomes the introduction among us of a practice, observed in some churches abroad, of choir and people singing in alternate verses the Gloria and the Credo. In how many a young ear, in the hour of temptation, may the words thus familiarised, *vitam venturi saeculi*, sound, and save by their recurrence! Where the congregation consists of boys at school learning Latin, this practice should be easier than elsewhere. Often have I thought with regret how the long and costly classical education, which our upper class boys receive, is thrown away upon them, for all immediate purpose of piety and sanctification. They hardly know any Latin prayers except

the Litany of Loreto, and in later life they never say any. They have not been taught to use a Latin Missal : the Vesper Psalms they take to be others' concern, not theirs. Needless to say, they never think of reading St. Augustine's Confessions in Latin, or a Gospel in Greek. They acquiesce in forgetting their classics for all purposes of this world and the next. Yet Church Latin is not difficult, nor New Testament Greek. They may be excellent Christians notwithstanding, but they have cast away one bond at least which might have drawn them into closer union with the worship of Mother Church.

To return to ordinary congregations of men and women, who have never learnt Latin. How are they ever to be got to take part in a Latin Liturgy, sing a Latin hymn, or say in their hearts a Latin prayer? The thing is easy—through the children. So it was done in the Middle Ages, as Chaucer shows; so it can be done, is being done, now. In a church less than ten miles from Carfax (the centre of Oxford), there is a surpliced choir, composed of boys from the elementary school. They sing all the Music of a Plain Chant High Mass without a fault. They sing correctly the *Dies Irae*; they have sung the *Stabat Mater*, all through, without accompaniment and even without a conductor. Any

Catholic boy in that church is taken to sing, who is willing, and who has got an ear for music, whatever be his voice. If this example were copied, wherever possible, in our churches,—I do not suppose it to be possible everywhere,—thirty years would see congregations spring up, men and boys, all knowing the ecclesiastical chant and apt to sing it. Thus the Sunday Mass, remaining what it ever is essentially, the unbloody sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, would further be rendered, to the glory of God and the great edification of man, *a sacrifice of praise, the fruit of lips confessing to His name* (Heb. xiii. 13).

One last word on Hymnology. The Bishops of England have taken up the much-needed reform of the hymns sung in our Churches, both words and music. We have the Bishops' Hymn-book with the music proper thereto. One is glad to see included in it some half-dozen of the finest Latin hymns of the Church. Hymns, more than histories, lose in translation. Who has ever adequately expressed in any vernacular the *Lauda Sion* or the *Stabat Mater?* So may the Latin of these hymns revert to the Christian people of this country. 'Revert,' I say, for it was the possession of lay-folk in the Middle Ages. Our people are not so dull but that, having the Latin in their hands and translations easily accessible,

they will come to understand the Latin, as it grows familiar upon their lips.

Note to page 7.

Omit the word 'Hebrew' wherever occurring on this page.

Note to page 8.

The *Codex Amiatinus*, A.D. 700, actually reads *chirographum decretis*.

THE "WORD" OF GOD:

ITS

PAGAN AND JEWISH BACKGROUND

BY

C. C. MARTINDALE S.J. M.A.

THE "WORD" OF GOD: PAGAN AND JEWISH BACKGROUND.[1]

—:—

THE *Lutterworth Lectures* are described as being upon "Christianity and Language"; and aim, in part, at showing that the original languages which enshrine divine revelation may convey meanings which have hitherto eluded, and must often necessarily elude, the most accurate of translations. Such, perhaps, is the case when, at the beginning of the Fourth Gospel, we read: In the beginning existed the *Word*, and the *Word* was with God, and the *Word* was God. . . . . And the *Word* became flesh.—Only the dulling force of long acquaintance can make these expressions seem to us anything but mysterious, not to say bizarre. Where we read *Word*, however, the author wrote *Logos*, and set stirring in the minds

1 The following essay was to have been read as the second *Lutterworth Lecture*. This was prevented by the indisposition of the writer, who gladly takes this occasion of thanking the Very Rev. Father V. M'Nabb, O.P., Prior of Holy Cross Priory, Leicester, for the assistance he so generously gave, by speaking at a few minutes' notice on a subject cognate to that treated of in the following pages. I have of course tried so to state the facts dealt with as not to exceed the scope and intention of the *Lutterworth Lectures*; and in view of this I hope not to be taken to task for the relative fewness of references, explicit quotations, technical notes and the like, which could only be absolved from the charge of pedantry when in their proper place, a scientific treatise.

In so short a paper I have, almost of necessity, only "said what has been said," as Herodotus would put it; and in many places have followed almost rigorously the admirable articles of Father J. Lebreton, S.J., which appeared first in the *Etudes*, vol. cvi., 1906, pp. 54, 310, 764, and again, recast and perfected, in his masterpiece, *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, Paris, 1910, vol. 1.

of his hearers innumerable recollections, surmises, ideas and ideals, which, without much preparation, can never rise in ours. In this lecture I wish to indicate most briefly what the expression *Logos* connoted in the first Christian century, and to do this we must outline the whole of its long and complicated religious and philosophical history. For it was the confused and sometimes contradictory reasonings, and dreamings, and fancies of whole centuries and many nations which made the background to the elusive figure of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John.

I.—PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION.

The Greek *Logos* connotes more than does the English *Word*—"a part of speech."[1] *Logos* means rather a *reasonable statement;* the account which may be given of a thing; the intelligible expression of its nature and character. The *unaccountable* person is ἄλογος; disconcerting accidents happen παραλόγως. The man trained to consider facts systematically is the λογικός; the habit that *collects* and arranges their λόγοι, is logic. A *reasoned account*, then; and if the "reasoned" be stressed, λόγος tends to connote the *plan* of a thing; its definition; the underlying notion, or immanent idea (as Plato would say); the ulti-

1 The Greek for this would be more accurately ὄνομα or ῥῆμα.

mate, but intrinsic, truth which makes it what it is: if the "account" be stressed, λόγος will suggest the utterance, the externalization, of an idea; the notion expressed in fact—a quasi-incarnation. Supposing then, what actually happened, that philosophers agreed to use the term *Logos* in their systems, it yet is clear that those systems would at once fall into two groups; the identical term *Logos*, differently handled, might become the watchword of two instantly divergent, indefinitely ramifying tendencies of thought, by one of which the *logoi* will be set in a mental, ideal, disincarnate world, while the other will involve, in some sense or other, the utterance, externalization, realization, *personification* it may be, of a *Logos*. Let us watch this happening.

Greek philosophy began in Ionia, and was at first anti-religious, monistic, and static. I mean, it disregarded, or denied, the gods, and tried to explain the universe in terms of a single inert element, earth, *e.g.*, or water. Heracleitos[1] guessed that Force and Motion underlay all things. For want of a better word he called this unique, ultimate force, *fire:* an eternal, intelligent fire, he held, permeated and governed all things; an infinite, immanent Reason, responsible, as for

1 St. Justin ranks him among the "Christians before Christ," 1 Ap. 46.

the whole, so for each part, and for the reason therefore of each thinking man. And this, Sextus Empiricus says, he called the *Logos* of the world.

Then came the Persian wars. Philosophy seemed stifled on the Asiatic coast; but the astonishing triumphs of the European Greeks transferred the centre of activity to the West. For Athens, now first really conscious of herself, her powers stimulated to their extremest energy, blazed out into that Periclean period of art and literature for which history has no adequate parallel; and this was followed, as the first ebullition of artistic emotion always is, by a phase of reflection—in Athens, of high philosophies. But notice: Heracleitos had made philosophy *dynamic*, but had left it *monist*. Now, it becomes *dualist*. Two powers in the universe strive for mastery. Can it be that Persia, materially beaten back, achieved this moral or intellectual victory over her conquerors, and moulded their thought in what was, at least, to become her most characteristic category? For, to the Persian, the whole world will be conceived as the battlefield, nay, as itself the battle, between Light and Darkness, Truth and Falsehood, ultimate good and all but absolute evil. And this seems an essential, too, in the systems derived from Plato and from Aristotle.

For with Plato, God and matter are irreconcilable. God, no doubt, is Father, Builder, Pilot of the Cosmos, but wholly outside it. The *logoi* of things, or (for Plato does not use that word) their *ideas*, shine in a disincarnate world, broken lights, the prismatic constituents of the comprehensive, white Idea. A later school will make of them God's thoughts, intermediate between His inviolable self, and creation. But for Plato, the opposition between God and matter remains irreducible. The Idea, plunged in matter, loses its identity. At no time could Plato have recorded that the idea was made flesh. Not from him could John have borrowed his Evangel.

His theory is complicated, however, by his doctrine of a World-Soul—*anima mundi*. The Cosmos, he argued, is the best possible : but the animate is better than the inanimate : therefore the Cosmos has a soul. In consequence, he mythologizes freely : he speaks of the world in terms of personality ; it is God's only-begotten son, and the *Timaeus* is full of solemn and tender language expressive of this sublime relation. But this is endlessly important. It is the point at which Platonism may be linked to monist dogma, and so indeed the Stoics were to link it. For as father lives in son, so God's *logos* shall live in the universe, His offspring ; it shall be the outward

expression of the Invisible, His Image and His Glory. Yet immense as will be Plato's influence in this as in every other direction, practically none of the later forms of Logos-doctrine are genuine developments of his thought. Not only was he freely "translated" into language not really equivalent to his own, not merely were Platonists confused with Plato, but what he meant as myth —the human expression of the inexpressible—was taken relentlessly *au pied de la lettre*, and his ironical, or pathetic, or heavenly imagery was solemnly used as material for systems.

Yet Aristotle's influence was greater still. It might have astonished him, as it does ourselves at first, to see on which side it fell. For who so hopelessly dualist as Aristotle? What so utterly transcendent, aloof, absolute in the fullest sense, as his God, the final cause of the Cosmos? Source is He indeed of the world's activity; but how? κινεῖ ὡς ἐρώμενον. As our whole being may be set in commotion by the mere approach of one we love—himself unloving, it may be, and even unaware of our proximity,—even so Aristotle's God, unconscious of the world He thrills into vitality, without will, not a Providence, resides disinterested in all save in His own self-contemplation. Disinterested; uninterested. Exactly! and hence, uninteresting. Aristotle's real

interest turned world-wards. Our improved conditions of observation have produced results eclipsing for us Aristotle's passionate interest in *facts*—I mean, the tangible, verifiable facts of sensible experience. Here, not in God, was his fittest field of research; and here he observed a force at work, immanent in things, an efficient cause, intelligent and teleological, true Demiurge of the universe, Nature herself, φύσις, whom in moments of enthusiasm he will call God. He rejected the "world-soul"; but here we have its practical equivalent. Though he speculated little, if ever, on what this Force *was*, being wholly occupied with what it *did*, the schools at once interpreted him as having taught the immanent Logos; and when the monistic Stoics rejected his doctrine of the four Causes, and kept only the efficient, φύσις, which they identified with his Final cause, God, we see at once how both Plato and Aristotle, those gigantic intellects which have dominated thought until to-day, became, in spite of their dualism, at the service of those who would regard all things as a single expression of one intrinsic force, a divine and immanent Logos. Hence the Stoics, though monists, are profoundly coloured by Plato and Aristotle.

The Stoics made much of this Logos; but as it was inextricably involved with their general

metaphysic, we cannot but very briefly outline this.

Zeno, founder of the Stoa, seals the final abandonment of all mechanical explanations of the Universe. His system was almost pure monistic dynamism : and so truly does his thought descend from Heracleitos that he will adopt even the fire-imagery of that philosopher. Life is action ; nature is not only the law of the world, but also the source of its energy ; not alone its formula, but its motor. The All is the varying manifestation of a Force working necessarily and according to a necessary plan. This universal Logos, this Plan, or,—since here above all we must avoid a static terminology—this Germ inevitably unfolding itself, holds within it all the λόγοι σπερματικοί, the subordinate plans or germs, of all future phenomena.[1] Hence, all that ever was, remains in all that is ; what is, contains all that ever is to be. The Universe is a living Logos : God pervades the whole—like honey in a comb, said Tertullian, not too happily : an Artificer immanent in his work, said Galen : the *soul* in Nature, to revert to the old symbol. *Mens agitat molem :* Mind thrills the mass, sang Vergil, trying for the moment to play the Stoic. More exactly he tells how in some creatures—bees, for instance,

1 These are the *rationes seminales* so much used by Augustine in his account of creation.

and ants—the One Mind dwells especially. For, say the Stoics, the universal Logos can manifest itself but partially, as ἕξις, or τόνος—just *resistance*—in mere matter; as φύσις or effort, in plants; as ὁρμή or blind forward rush, in brute animals; as λόγος, finally, self-ruling effort, or conative consciousness, in man. And as λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, pervasive, immanent vitality, it unites the individual to the secret life of the whole world; as λόγος προφορικός, it carries him outward and beyond himself to vital union with his fellow-men in love and service, and with God in prayer.

Hence the whole duty of man is to conform himself to this plan, to live by its life. And hence a splendid paradox. The perfect man is he who best sinks his selfhood in the whole, who joins obediently in the great movement of the universe; who does not struggle, chafe, grasp, shirk; and yet it is this very man who is the αὐταρκής the self-sufficient, the truly Independent. For the universal self has become his *own* self; the universal Logos is immanent *in him*, is *his* logos. He is supremely, unconquerably autonomous. All sin, is the putting one's self against, or outside, this tendency of law and force in things. How present a help this ethic became in time of trouble is evident; and its enormous development in the

persecutions, for instance, of Nero or Domitian, especially in the theological form of which Seneca is the mouthpiece, is very impressive. It fostered too that sense of universal brotherhood which expressed itself in the symbol of a Holy City, or the Dear City of God, on whose register great and small, " barbarian, slave, the mean people, and the poor, and the ugly "—I am quoting Lucian,—were all written, because one living Logos united them. In it no part was poor, because the whole was sublime. To *choose*, for one's self, Chrysippus said, the life of a buffoon, were dishonour. But should God's plan assign to one that life, well, it were a high thing to be even " God's buffoon." Nay, even those who resist are subordinated by this Logos to itself, and rebels serve in their own despite. " Reflect then," said Marcus Aurelius, " in which class thou wilt set thyself ; in any case He who rules the universe shall make a place for thee in one or another of His groups of workmen." Thus even seeming evils work together for good : [1] and in the Logos there is none but may rejoice.

1 Cleanthes sang :

Ah, but Thou hast wit to fashion Even out of Odd, to bring
Law from Chaos, and the hateful make fit matter for Thy love :
Thus of all things good and evil linkest Thou one perfect Thing,
That through all Thy whole creation one eternal Word should move.

ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ τὰ πέρισσά τ' ἐπίστασαι ἀρτία θεῖναι,
καὶ κοσμεῖν τἄκοσμα, καὶ οὐ φίλα σοι φίλα εἶναι.
ὧδε γὰρ εἰς ἓν πάντα συνήρμοκας ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν,
ὥσθ' ἕνα γίγνεσθαι πάντων λόγον ἀιεν ἐόντα.

"What can I do," cried Epictetus, "I, a lame old man, save sing to God, and call to all men to join me in my praise."[1]

It would be impossible to draw out the consequences, or to outline the Stoic solutions to the obvious difficulties of this system which embraced the whole life of man, explained his beginning, affirmed his goal, issued a Categorical Imperative of personal behaviour and of social service, and reconciled the ideals of self-realization and renunciation. It is a fascinating doctrine even to our own minds; it pervaded whole layers of society and occupied most thinking men when Christianity appeared, itself in possession of a doctrine of an Omnipresent, All-governing God, an eternal and divine Providence, a visible revelation of the Absolute, and inculcating at once resignation and active brotherhood. Small wonder, then, that a Stoic-trained century, inclined, like our own, to classify new systems in the two or three categories it dealt with easily, should, as the Apologists make clear to us, have regarded Christianity as a School of Stoicism.[2]

II.—MYTHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS.

YET this Logos-lore was not a philosophy alone, not even a religious philosophy. It became

1 Diss. I., 16, § 20.

2 Cf. Celsus *ap.* Orig. c. *Cels.* vi. 71.

markedly mythological. The mystery of Egypt had always fascinated the volatile Greek, and now the Ptolemies had thrown open the great libraries of Alexandria and the temple archives to students. At Alexandria the allegorizing spirit, so tenacious of life in the Christian Fathers of that school, was already strong, and found identical tendencies in the Greeks, who indeed were forced to allegorize their ancient books, such as Homer, if that old literature, which they so passionately worshipped, was still to satisfy their always responsive, but fast developing, religious sense. Moreover, the anthropomorphic Greek could never help decorating his impressions and even ideas in more or less human form.

The consequences of all this were profound. The Logos-doctrines were on the one hand used as the key to a now allegorized mythology ; some myths, on the other, too stubborn to yield to this soliciting, served to array the Logos-doctrines and actually modified them.

At first Zeus, the One Supreme, was the natural symbol under which to speak of the Logos. Agathodæmon, "Good Spirit" (a curiously Persian flavour, here) ; Pan, who is the All ; Atlas, who upholds the heavens ; Eros, Love, who makes the world go round ; above all, the well-loved Herakles, so prominent in popular worship,

the incarnation of *effort*, of *work* in the world—the tenseness of whose bow was interpreted of the τόνος, the strain throughout the universe—all these, at one time or another, made robes for the concept of the Logos, and tended to *personify* that abstract notion or invisible force. But none of these so caught popular imagination as the identification of the Logos with Hermes, of whom myth told that he invented speech, and was messenger of God to man. Long ago Hermes had himself been identified with the Egyptian Thoth, who devised the Alphabet, gave literature and mathematics to man, and created the universe by no "muscular effort," but by his sole Omnipotent Word. Eight centuries before Christ this office of Thoth had been hymned: under the Ptolemies, "Thoth," and "Hermes Trismegistos," Thrice-Greatest, were convertible names. Notice, what predominates is not their immanence, their character of Logos, *i.e.*, reason, Thought, word-in-the-soul; but Logos frankly the *spoken word*, intermediary between one mind and another, God's messenger to man. Nothing could uproot this feeling about Hermes. Hence, rather than wholly volatilize this warm-blooded, sympathetic personality, the still fluid, too abstract *Logos*-notion was itself modified by him, and it comes more and more to represent the *Logos* as a middle-term, the

expression of God's self, or thought, to and in the creation ; and the tendency to represent it too in terms of *personality* is marked.

Plutarch,—whom we mention here, because though he was born just when Philo died (c. 50 A.D.), he continues and hands on a predominantly Greek tradition, while Philo, in spite of himself, remains a Jew—gathers from all sides, and applies to his *Logos*-system, all manner of myths. But with him Platonic dualism conquers anew. God is wholly transcendent : matter is self-existent, eternal, inert, law-less. God gives it life and meaning by impressing on it His own Logos, the exemplar of all organized creation, past or future, and the source of its energy. Here then the Stoic ideal of Law and Force unites with Plato's dualism. Providence is not *merely* an immanent, impersonal, Necessity stretching into, only because mechanically preparing, the future. It is an impulse from outside, from a personal God. Moral law is *imposed* by God, and does not *emerge* from nature. Providence pre-supposes nature, and intervenes to correct and elevate it. Or rather, mere matter is unworthy the name of Nature ; a thing finds its true self only in the Divinely impressed scheme ; " Stronger is the bond," says Plutarch, " which girds the universe about, when it is girded not according to nature, but according to the *Logos*."

And what is true for the universe is true also for each individual soul. This, I think, is the nearest approach that I know of among pagans to the Christian doctrine of grace and the supernatural. But all this Plutarch stated in terms of many myths. To explain his method I will give one example.

Osiris, said the legend, had been slain and dismembered by the evil serpent Set : his spouse, Isis, sought for the fragments of his body over all the earth ; and Osiris, restored to life, becomes judge of all souls after death ; and they, once purified, are substantially united with him, and are named, themselves, Osiris.

Osiris is, says Plutarch, the divine Word, Spirit, Truth, Light, Life. *Set*, cosmologically, is matter,—ethically, Sin, Falsehood, symbolized by Darkness. In this world, spirit is immersed in matter, truth mated with a lie, the light struggles with black night. The Logos is mutilated, dismembered, but cannot wholly perish. Immortal, indestructible, it finds a resurrection ; in the end the disfigured plan shall be re-perfected ; on the basis of this ideal all souls shall be judged ; not until all deformity have been purged away shall they be pronounced its faithful counter-part ; and, behold, by the mere fact of that conformity, they have become organically united with Itself. On this the pagan writes :

"This thing that our priests to-day, with prayer for mercy and in dim revelation, most reverently do hint, even that Osiris is King and Lord among the dead, bewilders the minds of most men who know not how the truth of this thing is. For they fancy that Osiris, in whom most surely is all holiness of God and of nature [1] is thus said to be in the earth and beneath the earth, where are hidden the bodies of those who seem to have had their end. But Osiris' self is far indeed from earth, untouched, undefiled, immaculate of all substance that admits of corruption and of death. And souls of men, here in the embrace of bodies and of passions, have no communion with the God save as in a dream, a dim touch of knowledge through philosophy. But when they are set free, and shift their homes into that Formless and Invisible and Impassible and Pure, then in truth is God their Leader and their King, even this God, so that fastened unto Him, and insatiably contemplating and desiring that Beauty ineffable and indescribable of man—wherewith the old legend would have it that Isis was in love, and did ever pursue and with it consort—all beings there are fulfilled of all the good and fair things that have share in creation." [2]

1 Plutarch fancifully derived the name *Osiris* from the twofold sanctity expressed by the words ὅσιος and ἱερός.

2 *Isis and Osiris*, 382, E.

The treatment of this section has been short, chiefly because the principles are easily formulated, and nothing remains save to illustrate them by quoting many myths. Only through one other phase did the Logos-doctrine pass before definitely facing Christian Apologetic. Through Cornutus (c. 60 A.D.), Seneca (70 A.D.), and Epictetus, we reach the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, to whom St. Justin and Athenagoras addressed their Apologies. But the pagan system has reached its term. Thoroughly monistic, once more, the Emperor's philosophy is mingled, none the less, with Platonist symbolism ; yet, so flagging is the current, that it cannot waken in him that splendid optimism and impetus of the earlier Stoic philosophers. He exults, at times, no doubt, in the tremendous spectacle of Nature and universal Law ; he rebukes himself, because it seems so easy to love Athens, yet so difficult to cry "Dear City of God," when he contemplates the world : but this great thing stuns, not stimulates him ; the Logos is One, no doubt, in himself as in the All, yet not for that can he feel himself *cosmocentric*, as did the older thinkers, but an atom merely, swept along in the hurtling rush of Necessity. True, he pictures his *logos* as a spirit in him ; he must obey it, serve it and venerate it ; and again, keep it pure and undefiled ; it is now a tutelary genius ; and

again, a deposit indescribably precious—and this language marks his debt to Platonism. But in the end, when he sees sin and folly round him, and sickens to feel them in him, when he leaps into eager longing at the thought of personal immortality, and must beat back that desire with the dogma that nothing such exists, well, it is no true optimism that bids him be at peace, reflecting that, if so it is, so it must be ; and what must be, must be best.

To the serene, stern Emperor, the two Christians offered their "Apologies." Did he read them ? Who can tell ? Probably his exhausted soul could scarcely in any case have reacted to their buoyant joyfulness. As I said, the currents of life were slackening ; or, at least diverted to new channels.

III.—PHILO TO THE END.

Philo died about 50 A.D. His works alone remain entire and authentic of that enormous output of Alexandrian (*i.e.*, Hellenized-Jewish) literature of which what else survives is fractional, mutilated, pseudepigraphic, or anonymous. This is probably why we hear so much of him, not because he originated much, or had any very wide and lasting influence. Moreover, now that the reckless assertion that St. John borrowed his Logos-doctrine from Plato has been abandoned—

we have seen that Plato personally says nothing about the Logos—it is preferred to derive it from Philo, whose Logos-lore is highly developed and important.

An extraordinary spirit had prevailed for some time among the Jews of Alexandria. Conscious that to them had been committed the oracles of God, yet intellectually awakened by contact with the world, and fired into curiosity by the feverish mental activity of great centres like Alexandria, they perceived that the Jewish religion gave the answer to not one of the philosophical questions which so passionately occupied the Greeks. And no wonder, for the Jewish consciousness had never asked itself those questions. The only question for the Jews was : How explain the history of the chosen nation over whom Yahweh's name was called ? and their only answer was in terms of their own sin or righteousness, rewarded by Yahweh, Himself righteous and absolute. But now they stood face to face with alien mythologies and foreign philosophy. Intensely loyal still, intensely national, they resolved to sacrifice nothing. On the one hand they read their own doctrines into the mythologies, and detected an original Jewish inspiration for the Sibylline books, the tales of Thoth, the Orphic mysteries, and the rest ; on the other, they now elaborately deduced

from their own literature the systems of ethics, psychology, metaphysics, even physics, which they encountered, determined to have priority and primacy all along the line. Manifestly this was impossible without a wholesale allegorizing of their sacred books. Allegory, Philo indeed affirms, is not only a legitimate, but the traditional and true method of exegesis.

Philo mentions sufficient of his predecessors' work to show how purely *representative* was his own. Some of them, in their eagerness to find all science in their scriptures, had suggested that when the text laid down Levitical rules for dismemberment of sacrifices, it did but mean to teach that the All is one, and the one, many. The seven-branched candlestick really hinted at the seven planets; the high-priest wears bright vestments over a purple tunic because the thick, dark air lies beneath the shining ether: the twofold account of the creation in Genesis reveals how, first, the ideal man was created, and placed in some heavenly "intelligible" world; the material man, made later, was set in Paradise. The two cherubim of the tabernacle are the two Cosmic Hemispheres; the "Fathers" to whom Abraham after death "is gathered," are the fixed stars, or the four elements, or absolute ideas. So much for cosmology. As for Ethics, "Pharaoh, King of

Egypt," means that the soul rules the body. He is served by baker, butler, and butcher, but they are eunuchs ; this teaches that the three faculties of the pleasure-seeking soul are sterile for virtue. The tree of life means goodness in its most generic form, and so forth. The Logos was mentioned often enough. The Tragic Ezekiel (c. 180 B.C. ?) says it appeared in the burning bush to Moses.

How fantastic this exegesis might become can be illustrated from Philo's treatment of this category *logos*, which, of course, he wishes to discover in the Old Testament.[1] We shall see that he

1 Curiously enough (cf. Lebreton *ll. cc.*, and Hackspill, on the " Intellectual setting of the New Testament," *Revue Biblique*, X. 1901, pp. 202 seq.), the *Wisdom* doctrine of the Jews appears not to have primarily affected Philo's *logos*-lore, though St. Paul, and even St. John, seem steeped in it. And the same seems to hold for the Old Testament treatment of God's *Word*. As for the *Wisdom* of God, the course of Jewish religion carried this concept far nearer to the dogma of the Third than of the Second Person of the Trinity. Indeed, Irenæus, and other Fathers, identify the *Wisdom* with the *Spirit*. It was necessary, given the Jewish temperament, that this *Wisdom* should be conceived, at first, essentially as practical and moral, not abstract or contemplative. It appears first, with any noticeable and religious force, in Job, especially ch. xxviii., which is less developed than the doctrine of Proverbs, especially cc. ix., x. ; though Job xv. 7, 8, is curiously parallel to Prov. viii. 25. Baruch, iii., iv., echoes both Job and Proverbs. Is there more, even in Proverbs viii. 25, 35–36 ; ix. sqq., than a metaphor, at best a personification ? The parallel personification of Folly, ix. 13, shows that no *hypostasis*, substantial personality, is intended. The rela ion of this Wisdom to God is, at least at first, no more than that of His attribute energizing outwards. That it *pre-exists* its creatures, however, is clear ; viii. 22, Ecclus. xxiv. 3 ; indeed, Wisdom, though disporting herself among creation, has, it would seem, no active *rôle* in the world ; in spite of the word κτίζω, we can never safely diagnose hypostasis : we do not know if it represented *qanah* or *bara ;* and nothing can be built on viii. 24. In the Alexandrian *Wisdom of Solomon* a distinction between God and His Wisdom is more nearly elaborated ; she is His exhalation (ἀτμίς), tributary (ἀπόρροια), effulgence (ἀπαύγασμα), mirror (ἔσοπτρον), image (εἰκών), &c.,

sometimes regards the *logoi*, logically, as the "ideas" of things, and, ontologically, as the ideal world, the *place* where these ideas dwell. Hence, whenever the word *place* or τόπος appears, he interprets it of the *logos*. Thus in Genesis xxviii. 10, "*he came to the place when the sun had set*," he proceeds: "Many see in the *sun* the symbol of intelligence and sensation, which we regard as criteria; and in the *place*, the divine *logos*; hence they interpret: The Ascetic meets the divine *logos* when the mortal and human light is set; and indeed as long as the intellect thinks it

imagery taken up in detail by the author to the *Hebrews*. Wisdom is a spirit (i. 6, ix. 17: vii. 22 ?), though strongly personified in vii. 27, viii. 1–4, x. She is the universal Artisan in viii. 6, vii. 21; almost the Logos in ix. 1, 2, 'Give me Wisdom which is seated by Thy throne;' and this notion of the wisdom as at once the Gift of God and eternally at rest near, or in God, is prominent in the Theology of the Third Person. But this pale suggestion of duality contains no hint, yet, of the Trinity save to the retrospection of one who has before him the "dogmatizations" of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Church. So highly Hellenized, Platonized, and, indeed, Stoicized, has the Wisdom category grown, that Clement of Alexandria actually thought (*Str.* v. 14) that it was hence the Stoics had derived their philosophy!

The doctrine of God's creative *word*, dâbâr, followed that of His wisdom, but remained even more shadowy and came within no real proximity to personification, still less, to hypostasis. We see it in Gen. i. 3; its rapidity of action is spoken of in Ps. xxxiii. 6, cvii. 15, cxlvii. 15, etc.; it is pictured in Zach. v. 1–14 as a flying scroll; in Is. lv. 10, it seems to have an action almost of its own. In the Book of Wisdom the personification is characteristically more complete, ix. 1, xviii. 15; cf. Ecclus. xlii. 15; xliii. 26; but these disparate, floating concepts did *not*, it is safe to say, converge, at least visibly to the Jewish outlook, even Alexandrian. There was not evolved from them a definite dogma, nor the prospect of a Person, united to, yet differentiated from, the Almighty, in whom these attributes should be focussed. The personification of the *Memra* or Word of God, in the Targums, is definitely post-Philonic, and may be due to him; for *Memra* is God's immanent reason-word; *dabar*, His uttered, creative word, and Philo's Logos is normally God's thought, immanent, or uttered only in creation.

firmly apprehends the intelligible, and sense the sensible, the divine *logos* is afar ; but when they have both recognized their feebleness, and have, so to say, veiled themselves, and set, straightway the true Reason appears, and salutes and embraces the ascetic soul, which, despairing of itself, awaits in the dark Him who must come from without." The Logos-doctrine was agreeable to the de-anthropomorphizing tendencies of post-exilic Israel which are so marked, for instance, in the Septuagint text, noticeably by the progressive substitution of such seemingly intermediate terms as the Angel of Yahweh, the Face, the Glory of Yahweh, the Heavens, for the actual name of God, in contexts where the direct agency of Yahweh had come to seem displeasing to the later Jews. This probably did not matter much to Philo.

Philo then took his faith, his unction, his illustrations, and his sanction from the Scriptures ; with equal deliberation he borrowed his philosophy from the Greeks, that is, from the Stoics. Here and there his faith forced him to modify this : *a priori* he had to assert a personal, provident, remunerative God, revealing Himself to man through prophecy. Where this interfered with Stoicism he used Platonic categories to help himself out. This eclectic, and I venture to believe confused system, I shall try to outline.

To take the question first quite in general. The *logos* is, for Philo, the Principle of Energy and Determination. This is exactly the Stoicism of Chrysippus. The Logos is the fecundating force in the world; an interior, ubiquitous, cohesive power; a rivet; a glue; a vowel between two consonants: like the soul in the limbs; like the Wise Man's will in relation to his virtues. Indefinitely diffused, its plenitude is not diminished; like gold, Philo oddly argues, which, however finely beaten out, remains impermeable. This "third nature" is, then, interposed between God and matter which, apart from the Logos, remains unorganized, unspecified, unqualified, undetermined. Historically, the impression of the Logos, an impetus along a given line, has spelt destiny. A cycle of Empires revolves, the universe *as a whole* getting good and ill in proper proportion, and emerging thus a Democracy. Or again the Logos is the Constitution of the universal City. Thus Philo links a Platonistic and transcendent God to the immanent Fate of the Stoics; yet with unhappy results; for, under the Stoic influence which predominates, he speaks of God almost in pantheistic terms, and over and over again calls Him ὁ νοῦς τῶν ὅλων, Universal Mind. Even when attacking the "Chaldeans" for teaching that the

world is God, or God the soul of the world, he adopts Stoic phraseology, and says that Moses taught that God strung the whole universe tight upon δυνάμεις and ἕξεις, two terms used by the Stoics to describe the essential, inherent qualities of matter, but by Philo fastened indeed to matter at the one end, yet at the other to God. Conscious himself that all this was rather unsatisfactory, Philo tried to help himself by Platonic, or perhaps Platonistic symbols, and the Logos as Law and Force is equated to the active Thought of God, at once Exemplar and Instrument. Hence constantly it is described as a seal, or stamp ; the idea which penetrates and gives meaning to things, and surpasses them inasmuch as it is a nearer reflection of the Supreme Reality, and more nearly creative in its function, than they are. *How* is matter moulded by it ? " In an ineffable and wonderful way," Plato had said, and Philo could add nothing.

What is the relation of the Logos to God ? It is the γένος γενικώτατον, the apex of the Platonic pyramid of ever more generalized ideas, subordinate only to the supreme and supersubstantial Idea, God.[1] Hence, logically, *logos* is

1 Philo symbolized this by the *Manna*, because he thought the Hebrew word *man* meant τί, " something," the all-but undifferentiated. Really *man* is interrogative, and means " what ? "

for Philo the *summa idea ;* ontologically it is the ideal world. In the ideal order we have the series : God, *logos*, powers,[1] ideas, and finally the visible world of things. In the real order, *logos* and the world in which it is impressed simply coincide.

" If [says Philo] we would use the simplest language possible, we must say that the world of ideas is, God's Logos constructing the universe ; for the ideal city is simply the reason of the architect proposing to found the city. This is Moses' doctrine, not mine ; for, when relating the formation of man, he distinctly says that man was made in the image of God ; now if the part—man—is the image of an image, and if the whole form, *i.e.*, the whole of this sensible universe is the resemblance of the divine image, it is clear that the archetypal seal, which we call the Ideal World, will be the divine Logos."

In still simpler language : the divine Thought can be regarded as in God ; then it *is* God. Or as expressed in creation ; then it *is* creation, in so far as faithfully, though finitely, mirroring God's self. Or (and here we shall see is the danger-zone), it can be conceived inadequately by man as something in itself, intermediate between God,

1 Δυνάμεις : God's creative, royal, remunerative activities, invested here, as in the philosophy he borrowed from, with a quasi-subsistency.

whence it (as we say) proceeds, and the world, into which it issues. Philo's monotheistic creed saved him from the hierarchized and ever grosser " emanations " placed by contemporary and later thought between the Highest and the lowest : but his series,—*logos*, powers, ideas, material creation —went very far towards it.

The Logos, he proceeds, is God's shadow. This is what appeared in the Theophanies.[1] This is what the imperfect contemplate ; for the carnal see but the material universe ; a few, made perfect, like Moses, see God Himself. Rapid runners alone, he says, allegorizing the Old Law, reach that metropolis. The rest must be content with the intermediate Cities of Refuge, world, ideas, powers, or *Logos*.

This then is the *Logos* in its relation to God. In creation, it is God's instrument, the mediator between God and matter incapable of intercontact. Even so, it only gives the primal thrust to the ordering of the world. As Plato entrusted this to lesser Gods, the Supreme God only starting the cosmic process, so Philo sometimes makes Yahweh remit this elaboration of the world to lesser *logoi* or powers, to whom He spoke when He said,

1 And how many Christian Fathers will echo this fancy—from the disastrous premiss that the *Logos* is in some sense essentially ordered towards the revelation of the Invisible Fount of Being !

"Let us make man." Here enters in the famous λόγος τομεύς, or the "*scissive* word." God's reason has a function analogous to ours, when our judgment cuts up the confused, barely differentiated, primary perception. The *logos*-seal expresses as it were the positive side of individuality,—I am what I am : the scissive-*logos*, the negative—I am *not* the rest of the world. And this notion goes back to Heraclitus, and Philo practically confesses this. But though we see, more or less, what the *Logos* does, and even what it is, once it is *in* the world, and again, how it exists in God, we still are in the dark as to its intrinsic nature. Is it identical with God ? or a distinct hypostasis—a Person ?

Quite clearly—and here all are agreed—in so far as it is a link, a cohesive principle in the world, that is, in so far as Philo is faithful to the Stoics, it cannot be a Person. But in his fluid and confused philosophy, is there not room for a Judaic, or Alexandrian conception, clashing with the former, yet juxtaposed to it, of the Logos as a Person ? When he calls it God, or God's High Priest, Prophet, Eldest Son, Angel—and recollect the deliberate substitution, in some places especially of *Genesis*, of the phrase *Angel* of Yahweh, for the simple and divine name, a practice which almost imposed a connotation of personality upon

that phrase wherever used—when, then, Philo uses these expressions, can it be supposed that they are mere metaphors void of doctrine? Many have thought this to be impossible. Modern writers, however, tend to depart from this view, and to declare that Philo did *not* regard the Logos as a Person. Thus, when he thrice calls it God, he does so only because the allegorical exegesis happens to force him to, and he apologizes for the inexact language. When he calls it *Angel*, we are reminded that he constantly treats Angels as symbols merely of abstract notions. Thus Hagar meeting the Angel, is Encyclopædic Education in collision with the Divine Logos! Again, he has a passion for literary personification. Laughter is the "immanent Son of God"; the world is God's Son, and the divine *Sophia*. The human *logos*, reason, is as boldly personified, though assuredly Philo did not hold it to be a person: it is the High Priest who enters the Holy of Holies once a year, that is, at long intervals achieves divine contemplation. As Conscience, it is priest, king, and judge, not to be intimidated, to be implored to remain with us. It is the soul's Father, as Education is its Mother. Again, it is the soul's Husband. As for λόγος προφορικός, sheer

1 Cf. M. J. Lagrange, *L'Ange de Jahveh* in *Rev. Bibl. XII.* (1903). H. B. Swete, *Introd.* to *O. T. Greek*, p. 327 (1900).

speech, it is the Interpreter, Brother, Prophet, herald of Reason ; the defender, friend, intimate, companion, councillor of the soul. It is impossible to set Philo in order if we insist on taking these expressions as more than metaphorical, especially when we study the relations between the divine Logos and the divine Σοφία or Wisdom Usually identified, they yet appear related now as source to stream, and again as stream to source. The δυνάμεις, or divine Powers, cause worse confusion. For while Philo says that the soul perceives these simply because it is not strong enough to contemplate the Divine Essence, though with this they are really identified, yet he also asserts that the Logos is actually *between* these δυνάμεις and God, that is, still more closely identified with Him, if that be possible, than they. How then can any distinction between Logos and Divine Essence be other than one elaborated merely by human reasoning ? How, that is, can the Logos be a *separate* Personality ? But unfortunately in proving this identity, have we not sacrificed the whole *raison-d'etre* of Philo's assertion of Logos and " powers " alike ? that is, the need of some essentially intermediate force to enable the inviolable Spirit to come into contact with matter ? Does not this mark a radical contradiction in Philonism ? The Gnostics, certainly,

in order to avoid admitting one, refused rather to admit the identification of God and Logos. Zeller, Schürer, and Caird[1]—first-rank authorities—admit the contradiction. Lebreton perhaps more acutely sees that Philo is trying to express, "on the one side the perfect being in God, which transcends us, and on the other, His action which reaches us, and His brilliancy which strikes us." "Relations" bind us to God, not God to us. "This distinction of absolute and relative in regard to God was never clearly expressed by Philo, but it appears in keeping with the line of his thought, and no other explanation, it may be, can harmonize the innumerable antinomies in his writings.[2]

It appears impossible to say more than that of the three great Churches which crystallized in opposition to the Christian, the Manichean drove the dualistic idea to an extreme, and modelled its organization, at least in the West, closely upon the Christian.[3] As far as I know the Logos practically lapsed from its working system. Gnosticism is a generic name covering quite a number of those mixed sects, in which pagan, Jewish, or Christian

1 "Philo employs all the resources of symbolism, allegorical interpretation, and logical distinction, to conceal from others, and even from himself, the fact that he is following out two separate lines of thought which cannot be reconciled." (Caird, *Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers*, ii. 201, 1904.)

2 Pp. 793–4.

3 Augustine was for many years a devout catechumen of this Church.

elements variously predominated, by-products of the ferment caused by the introduction of the strong new faith into the seething cauldron of contemporary religions and philosophies. These struggled to explain, among other things,—what we leave, wisely, as a mystery—the *how* of creation ; and a hierarchy of emanations, from God down to the maker of matter, was arranged. Notable among these were the Logos and the Sophia. The indescribable silliness and moral degeneration reached by certain Neo-Platonists can only be measured by the exquisite purity and sublimity attained (if not maintained) by others. Still working, like the other two systems, on the basal dogma of Dualism, they taught a mental and physical asceticism whereby the soul should emancipate itself and soar to God. This led men to sanctity, vice, or madness, according to those as yet uncoded laws which govern human psychology.

We are thus enabled briefly to summarize our examination of these varied data.

The Greek word *logos*—" reasoned account "—was generally applied to mean the *plan* of a thing, and in particular the plan of the universe. This plan could be conceived of either as latent in a mind, or as expressed in the actualized thing. Practically, it could mean, an *idea*, or a (spoken)

word. In the case of God and the universe it meant the divine Thought conceiving that universe, and again, the Universe itself, the expression of that Thought. Thus this *logos* existed at once in God and in creation. For Monists, God and His Thought were *only* in, and indeed identified with, the Universe. But victorious Dualism conceived of God as other than, pre-existing to, the Universe. Hence the Logos, immanent from Eternity, in the Divine Mind, was *spoken* at the moment of Creation, and its history contained two phases, as it were, an Eternal, Invisible existence within God, and an external "utterance" in terms of visible, created life. Various mythologies clothed this notion in human forms: this mysterious Word is pictured as a Person. Philosophy again traces its career not alone in the metaphysical and cosmological areas, but in the ethical; all human life is bidden model itself upon it. The unique religious system of the Jews fastens, in one of its schools, upon this splendid contribution of pagan environment; the antique traditions of their race, and an independent notion of God's Mandate (stereotyped in their austere and gorgeous literature), and allied developments of their Wisdom-lore, assist the writers who are fain to interconnect Judaic and Hellenistic categories. And in the confused civilization of the Asiatic

peninsula, where Greek and Palestinian cultures, Alexandrian and Persian speculations, Egyptian and Roman worships, and infiltrations from India herself, would meet in a hundred different connections, the Logos would be discussed. In lecture-rooms, in pamphlets, in learned books, in mystical "elevations," in the sermons then becoming popular, the name would recur. The sound of its syllables echoed all around the new Community within which the Fourth Gospel was written. What the writer of that Gospel meant by the term he adopted in his prologue we have so far nowhere hinted. We have but palely reconstructed his intellectual environment, or background, or atmosphere. But we believe it would be contrary to his mentality, as that Gospel reveals it, and to the whole spirit of early Christianity, to suppose that in adopting the term he adopted too the notion. Indeed, as we have seen, there was no one notion to be thus adopted. He took over no current system, nor identified what he had to offer with anything that men already had.[1] He did not

1 Lebreton, in his admirable note I, *Trinité*, p. 514, points out that, while it is clear that the "Logos" reached John through Hellenized, not purely Palestinian channels—in *no* case do non-Hellenistic books hold trace of it—yet he uses it in a "Palestinian," not an Alexandrian, manner. In Philo it is essentially the *thought*, in John the Word of God: Philo calls it God's First begotten, in contrast to the world, His second-begotten: but in John the Logos is the Only-begotten. Philo's logos is essentially the image or shadow of God: in John, who sees the Son, sees the Father Himself. Philo's logos is a mediator, a

welcome any school, or group of schools, with a cry of recognition, or of gratitude ; " My Jesus is your Logos." The proposition must be inverted ; John's dogma must correct the rest. " What you seek, I have. What you surmise, construct, deduce, symbolize, I possess and assert. Your Logos should be my Jesus."

" Many miracles [says Father Lebreton][1] guarantee the origin of the Gospel doctrine ; here, the doctrine itself is the surest miracle of all. At a moment when all the philosophers and schoolmen of the age were exhausting themselves with dissertations upon a Logos of which they could not even define the notion, a poor fisherman gives us of that divine Word a revelation so profound that no human thought will ever exhaust its riches ; so firm, that on it the religious life of all humanity will be able, henceforth, to lean. This simple fact is a prodigy more manifestly divine than a resurrection from the dead.[2]"

Yet not John himself would have thought, or wished, the dreams and efforts of the centuries to be annulled, simply, by his doctrine. In that long

real half-way, intermediate nature, a link between two separate, antagonistic objects. In John it mediates because compenetrating, and welding into one, the two extremes. In Philo, then, it is divine ; in John, God.

1 P. 794. 2 Cf. Hil. *Trin.* ii. 23 : Migne. *P.L.* x. 66.

and complex history not all had been but cheated efforts and the lifeless interweaving of sterile speculations. In his Prologue, he bids our thoughts revert to that Beginning, when over the meaningless and trackless waste of waters the Breath of God was brooding. And similarly we are authorized to see, co-ordinating the cross-currents of human thought and aspiration—chaotic and contradictory to the careless eye—a divine Plan, a *Logos*, an unceasing "Praeparatio Evangelica." *Christus cogitabatur*. Not an instinct revealed by all those centuries of spiritual effort, but finds, at once and fully, its justification no less than its satisfaction in the doctrine of the Word that was with God, and was God, and became Flesh.

A. E. Teeen, Printer, Rugby.

THE
BIBLE AND THE CHURCH

BY

GEORGE M. JAMESON B.A.

STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

THE BIBLE AND THE CHURCH.

Scimus enim quia bona est lex, si quis ea legitime utatur.
I. Tim. 1—8.

EVER since the remote age of the confusion of tongues, which divided mankind into many nations, separation has been caused quite as much by difference of language as by mountainous barriers or the *Oceanus dissociabilis*. These can be surmounted and crossed, but when the end of the journey lands the traveller among a people speaking an unknown tongue, he feels that the object of his enterprise, whether commerce, discovery, or settlement, is still a long way from being achieved. And he has to be on his guard against hostility; for, while nothing unites people like their mother tongue, nothing so arouses suspicion as a strange one. No one knows better than the average Englishman, commencing his travels on the Continent, the difficulty of making oneself understood by a foreigner. The natural English ceases to be of any avail, and, whether the stranger's language be German or French, it is equally unintelligible. Still, there is left the language of signs and

gestures, and common habits, by which communication may be established. But when a foreign language is not presented in the person of a live and intelligent foreigner, able and willing to assist in the task of mutual comprehension, but on a motionless written or printed page, in a strange alphabet, then the human mind has set to it a task which elicits to the utmost its powers of perseverance and ingenuity. It is then that the skill of the translator is called into being, to read the riddle and act as intellectual money-changer. A language which has reached this written stage, and become literary, enshrines not only sounds but ideas peculiar to itself. These ideas have been evolved and adopted through ages of environment, religion, and habits of the race to which the language belongs. They are not entirely incommunicable; but the exact phrase or word which would give the idea is not always to be found in a foreign tongue. And since translation consists, not in a change of words but in a transference of ideas, this is a difficulty which presents itself after the alphabet, grammar, and vocabulary have been mastered.

No literary languages have played such an important part in the history which concerns us to-day as Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. And

the reason is that in them the revelation of God, in so far as it is written, has been successively clothed. If I were to select their characteristics I should say that Hebrew is the language of poetry, Greek of philosophy, and Latin of authority. All three contribute to the formation of character. Poetry raises us above the every-day world, makes music of the emotions, and stimulates the search for the supernatural and the infinite. Philosophy gives definition and order to these aspirations, distinguishes the true from the false, and presents a clear system of metaphysical things to the understanding. Authority sets the seal on the process, by presenting the system so arrived at for the acceptance of the rational mind as a matter of duty and obligation.

All are realised in the Catholic Church ; which teaches with authority, defines with precision, and illuminates the mind with the richest eloquence and poetic imagery. And because of this association and service these tongues may fitly be classed as the three sacred languages. No other title so well records the fact that the Almighty has seen fit to make them the medium of communication between Him and His creatures. Sacred they are too, because, at the most sacred moment of the world's history, it

was in them that the inscription on the Cross was written. In Hebrew and Greek appropriately. The Scriptures which testified* of Him were in both. But why in Latin? It was the language of Rome, the language of the invader, the language of the abomination of desolation. Because, not yet sacred, it was being sanctified upon the Cross for future ages.

The last of these languages claims our special attention, because it is woven into our own history and language and stands forth as the missionary language of the world. The military prowess of the Roman, by which, inch by inch, he conquered town after town and province after province in Italy, Europe, Asia, and Africa, was hardly comparable to the wisdom with which he consolidated those conquests. Wherever he went he took with him the Latin language and the Roman law, thus spreading over the world one ruling language and one uniform system of jurisprudence. The world was being schooled into unity. Great empires have risen and set in the world's history but none of them has made its mark on the world as the Roman has done. Even her material ruins have an indefinable majesty. But wherein lies the true greatness

* John v. 39. John xix. 20.

of Rome? Not in her paganism, not in her luxury, not in her laws, not in her military domination; but in the wonderful transformation from paganism to Christianity, from rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's to rendering unto God the things that are God's, and becoming, in the words of S. Leo, "a priestly* and royal city, made by the Holy See of Blessed Peter the head of the world." This was where Rome fulfilled her destiny, and after a long and laborious growth through centuries in apparently an opposite direction, made manifest the purpose of God by becoming, instead of a persecutor of the Church the handmaid of the Lord; seemingly prepared for one task but actually equipped for another.

It was the language with such a history as this that became the language of the Church. The Romans had penetrated into all the known world and subdued it by arms. The Church was to penetrate into the unknown world and subdue it by love; to carry the Cross instead of the Eagle into continents undreamed of by Cæsar or Crassus, where, to-day, in Vera Cruz, San Salvador, Sacramento, Trinidad, Valparaiso, Santiago, Concepcion, are found the foot-prints

* Brev. Rom. 29. Junii.

of the Latin-speaking Church. That Church carried with it the even then venerable Latin Bible, which had become the legitimate heir of Hebrew and Greek as I shall now proceed to show.

By far the larger and more ancient part of the Old Testament was written in Hebrew; and the oldest and most frequent designation for the whole collection of Biblical writings was Hassephárim, the Books. This word occurs in Dan. ix. 2, where it is curious to note that both the Douai and Authorised Versions have missed the point, by translating "I understood by books"; instead of "I understood in the Books." The former has no particular point. The latter means "I understood in reading the Scriptures." This is one of the many instances which show the difficulty and delicacy of translation, and the wisdom and wariness needed by a translator. The Greek translation of Hassephárim is τὰ βιβλία, from which we get our word the Bible; which it is as well to be reminded means strictly, not the Book but the Books, not one but many. The Law was the exclusive possession of Israel and was regarded by them with the greatest reverence and affection, as appears from the 8th chapter of the 2nd Book of Esdras. Its text was transcribed with the

greatest care and accuracy, and the sacred characters were the object of a kind of enthusiastic worship to the Talmudists. That such an inheritance and treasure as this should ever be divulged and made common to the Gentile world, in a strange alphabet and foreign tongue, must at one time have seemed to the pious Jew a profane speculation. Yet the march of events, which seemed to have no connection with it, was to bring in about, and in this way.

The Greek empire of Alexander the Great being divided at his death among his four generals, Egypt, Libya, Arabia and Palestine fell to the lot of Ptolemy, afterwards called Soter or Saviour, He, being a learned prince, founded at Alexandria a Museum, or College of learned men, for the improvement of philosophy and the encouragement of all kinds of science; which eventually made Alexandria for a great many ages the greatest school of learning in the world. As part of this scheme he began getting together a library of books, which ultimately attained enormous dimensions. Such was its magnitude that when its books were destroyed by the Mahommedan invader in 642 as either containing what was in the Koran and therefore superfluous or what was not in it and therefore intolerable, their number, being com-

mitted to the flames, served for six months to heat all the public baths in Alexandria. Soter's son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, intent on the extension of this then growing library appointed Demetrius Phalereus, an Athenian, his librarian, directing him to procure from all nations whatsoever such books as were of note among them. Demetrius, being informed of the existence of the Law of Moses among the Jews of Palestine, acquainted the King therewith, and proposed that a letter should be written to Eleazar the high-priest at Jerusalem asking him to send from Jerusalem a true copy of the Hebrew Scriptures, and with it six chosen men out of each tribe of Israel who were skilled in the Hebrew and Greek tongues, to translate them into the latter. The embassy which bore this letter carried with them handsome presents, in gold and silver utensils ornamented with precious stones, for the service of the Temple. The envoys were welcomed with great respect by the high-priest and all the Jewish people, and having received from the high-priest a true copy of thc Jewish Scriptures written on vellum in letters of gold, in charge of seventy-two interpreters, returned rejoicing to Alexandria. There, it is said, the interpreters being placed in separate cells betook themselves to their labours, and in 72 days finished the

whole work, in such manner that there was no variance between them; and, as St. Irenæus says, "God was glorified, for they all agreed exactly from beginning to end in every phrase and word, so that all men knew that the Scriptures were translated by the inspiration of God."

Such is the sum of the account of the first monumental translation of the Bible; which has been transmitted to us by Aristeas, Philo, Josephus and other ancient authors. No story is ever told but that some later writer can throw doubt upon it or demonstrate by destructive criticism that the persons never existed and the events never happened. And so the internal evidence of the exactitude of this history has been subjected to the usual corrosive scrutiny of the incredulous learned. But while we have the fruits what matters the size or locality of the tree? Suffice it to say that this version whatever its origin became the Greek Bible, and was and is known as the Septuagint. Three printed editions of it of the 16th century are still extant at Alcala in Spain, Venice, and Rome; and one ancient MS. of the 4th century in the Royal Library at St. James's. It was read and quoted by the Evangelists and Apostles. It is more a Christian than a Jewish work, for it familiarised the

Gentile world with the Jewish prophecies and prepared the way for the reception of Christian ideas. And the production of this work and its habitual use as an authority had this effect, that when the New Testament came to be written it was written in Greek. Moreover it influenced the Liturgy of the early Church which for a long time, even at Rome, was in Greek and only slowly yielded to Latin. Traces of this remain in the Kyrie eleison of the Mass and the Agios o Theos of Good Friday. And so the world moved on a stage; from Hebrew to Greek. And whatever may be said of the intrinsic credibility of the story it records three noteworthy and commendable things, a reverence for Holy Scripture, a right method of procedure, and a belief in the superintending hand of Almighty God.

The next great translation of the Bible as a whole, and this time from both Hebrew and Greek into Latin, was not till 650 years later. In the interval, to meet the needs of the Western Church, partial and local Latin versions had been made in North Africa, and thence spread into Italy, where they were revised by superior scholarship, and the whole collection became current under the name of the "Itala." But this was more by use than by supreme authority,

and little by little errors, additions and variations crept in here and there, till, in the 4th century, the need was felt for a recension of the texts with a view to the production of a uniform version.

No Greek colour, no Oriental romance surrounds this translation. If there is glamour in numbers there is majesty in solitude. The burden, and more than the burden, which Seventy men are said to have thought it no shame to share fell this time upon the shoulders of another Atlas. A priest was found who, as sage, grammarian, and linguist, united in his single person all the qualifications for the gigantic task. Eusebius Hieronymus, commonly called St. Jerome, after years of arduous travel, East and West, devoted to laborious study, had become complete master, not only of Latin and Greek, but of Hebrew and its allied tongues.* His reputation preceded him; and in the year 382, being at Rome, he was invited by St. Damasus, Pope, to take the first step towards a Latin translation of the Bible by revising the New Testament of the Vetus Itala. He commenced his task, and did not desist till he had published to the Christian world the

* Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan.

Book which is now generally known as the Vulgate; of which the Council of Trent* subsequently decreed "that it is to be held authentic in public readings, discourses and disputes," which means that it contains nothing contrary to true faith and sound morals. So the last stage of the age-long journey was traversed, and, leaving Greek behind, the Church's Bible, containing all and not some only of the inspired Books, was with all due reverence, order, and respect, rendered in Latin; as a legacy of love and a possesion for ever.

After surveying these two ancient œcumenical masterpieces we must, if our subject is to be complete, turn our attention to the slighter and less durable vernacular versions made for the convenience of particular peoples. A demand for these gradually arose as the modern languages of Europe developed and called for expression, And notwithstanding all slanders to the contrary, nowhere propagated more strenuously than in our own country, it was never the wish of the Church to keep the people in ignorance of the text of the Psalter, the Gospels, and other edifying parts of Holy Scripture. This false accusation still stands in the

* Sess. IV. Decret. de Edit. et Us. Sacr. Lib.

Dedication of the Authorised English Version to King James I. where the translators say :—"We shall be traduced by Popish persons at home and abroad, who therefore will malign us because we are poor instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness." And this in spite of the fact that the Catholic Douai and Rheims versions in English of the complete Old and New Testaments had already been published, one twenty-nine and the other two years before. And even to the present day the popular edition of that work, bought and sold as the Holy Bible, omits those two instructive Sapiential Books, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus.

So long as vernacular versions were made under the supervision of competent authority, multiplied in the Scriptoria or printing-presses of the Monasteries, and were not false, defective, or corrupt, it had always, from the earliest times been the policy of the Church to permit and encourage their distribution among pious and well-disposed people as being the Word of God. In fact so far had she gone in this direction, so much through her agency had this fact been drilled into the minds of men that it is to her that Protestants owe the cardinal principle of

their system. That the Bible is the Word of God is not a Protestant discovery but a Catholic tradition. But there it is qualified by the tacit instruction that it is not the whole Word nor is it of private interpretation.*

But when persons in secret or open rebellion against the Church poured forth perverted and spurious versions for the use of false Christs and false prophets, she condemned and prohibited the possession and use of such versions. She did so, not because they were the Bible, but because they were not the Bible; and she exercised this power of prohibition infrequently and always with discretion and moderation.

One or two instances may show how by mistranslations, accidental or designed, the sense of the Word of God may be dangerously altered. The Angelic Salutation, *Ave gratia plena*, Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη, where the root is χάρις, without which St. Paul can hardly begin or end an Epistle, is rendered in the Authorized Version "Hail thou art highly favoured." "Favour" does not compel the understanding of spiritual graces; for in the same version it is used in contradistinction to them in Prov. xxxi. 30; "Favour is deceitful and beauty is vain: a

* John xxi. 25. II. Pet. i. 20.

woman that feareth the Lord she shall be praised," where favour is clearly used for external comeliness contrasted with internal grace. A learned Hebrew scholar,* in fact, explains this passage to mean "Female gracefulness and beauty are fallacious and vain." Between gracefulness and grace there is a wide distinction.

Another is in the story of the Marriage in Cana of Galilee, where our Lord is made to reply to His Blessed Mother "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" as a translation of the Greek *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ;* What is it to me and thee? What have we to do with it? Here the sense has been twisted, to support the idea that Protestants are not wrong in withholding veneration from our Blessed Lady if her own Divine Son set the example. It is true that in Mark i. 24, the same phrase is properly rendered "What have we to do with thee?" But this only makes the mistranslation under consideration more glaring, for there the interlocutors are in antagonism. The question is addressed to our Lord by an unclean spirit.

Another mistranslation that has had serious consequences is that in James v. 14; which reads "Is any sick among you? Let him call

* Rev. P. H. Mason, Cambs. Gram. Vol. I., p. 82.

for the elders of the church ; and let them pray over him anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick." On this a certain sect, taking from I. Pet. ii. 9, the name of "Peculiar People," as it is there translated, base their practice, in case of the illness of a child, of confining their care to sending for an elder of their sect, anointing the child with oil and praying over it, but not sending for medical assistance. Many a child whose life might otherwise have been saved has died under such conditions. If 'presbyteri' had been translated, as it should have been, 'priests,' instead of 'elders,' the Peculiar People would have been warned that this precept was for a Church which had priests, and not for them, and a fatal error might have been averted. But if such are the disastrous results of taking one* Sacrament out of its proper setting what may we expect if the whole Bible is similarly treated?

Another instance of a translation which though innocent entirely misses the point is that of Ps. ciii. 4, (in the Anglican order civ. 4,) where the Vulgate runs "*Qui facis angelos tuos, spiritus; et ministros tuos, ignem urentem.*" This is translated in the Psalter of the Anglican Book of

* Extreme Unction.

Common Prayer, which is taken from the Great Bible of Thomas Cromwell, Vicar General to Henry VIII., "He maketh his angels spirits: and his ministers a flaming fire," a rendering which is perpetuated in Heb. i. 7, in the Authorised Version and also in the Douai. But the real meaning is the reverse, as S. Gregory expounds to us in the following passage: "But we must know that the word 'Angel' is a name of office, and not of nature. For these holy spirits of the heavenly country are always spirits indeed but can by no means always be called Angels, because then only are they Angels when any tidings are announced by them. Wherefore also it is said by the Psalmist 'Qui facit Angelos suos, spiritus.' As if he had openly said 'Who of those whom He always has as spirits makes, when he pleases, also Angels.'*

Therefore the true rendering of the passage is, "Who makest spirits Thine angels: and flames of fire Thy ministers."

One more instance remains, and that is not so much a matter of mistranslation as of falsehood conveyed by innuendo. It may be called "The tradition of the Scarlet Woman," and consists

* Brev. Rom. 29 Sept. In Dedic. S. Mich.

in printing in capital letters in the 17th chapter of the Apocalypse the following words; "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." In spite of the very clear identification which follows in the next verse of this as the Rome of Nero it is a Protestant tradition that these words refer to the Catholic Church of Rome, and this is their way of impressing the tradition on the mind of the reader.

It will not surprise you to hear that these things have an ancestry, and to that ancestry I now propose to turn. It commences with William Tyndale. It is not too much to say that the aim and object of the English vernacular versions of this stock, made since the introduction of the printing-press, have been to separate England from the unity of the faith. The object of Tyndale and his successors was not to teach the people more vividly in English what they already knew and accepted, but to unteach it; not to wed them more closely to the Church but to divorce them from it.

That Tyndale is no discarded or forgotten protagonist is shown by the latest authoritative pronouncement on the subject in the Preface to the New Testament by the Revisers of 1881. "That translation" (the Authorised Version)

they say "was the work of many hands and several generations. The foundation was laid by William Tyndale. His translation of the New Testament was the true primary version."

Let us begin therefore with William Tyndale. He lived in the transition period of religion and literature, the reign of Henry VIII. The uses of the newly-invented Printing-Press were being discovered by a number of disaffected and irresponsible authors, who made it the vehicle for the dissemination of ribald and scurrilous tracts, principally teaching revolution and communism under a religious guise; such as "The Revelation of Antichrist"; "The Supplication of Beggars"; "The Parable of the Wicked Mammon." Most of these were from the pen of Tyndale, who had studied at Oxford and Cambridge and had taken Holy Orders. The grossness of some of his language would be offensive to modern ears, but some of his milder sayings will give the drift of his intention:—"Faith only, justifies"; "Alms deserveth no mede"; "Build no more churches or abbeys, but feed the poor"; "Ceremonies of the Church have brought the world from God"; "Churches are for preaching only." Having served this apprenticeship he conceived the idea of placing in the hands of the common people a New Testament so rendered into English

as to give colour to his tracts. He was not commissioned by the Church to make this translation nor did he ask for permission. He was about to raise the Bible as the standard of revolt against the Church and, conscious that he was engaged in a hostile enterprise, he chose a foreign country for his base of operations, and went first to Hamburg, afterwards joining Luther at Wittenberg. There he completed his New Testament which was embellished with a Prologue and notes inspired by the arch-heretic. This work was afterwards printed at Cologne or elsewhere on German soil and thence smuggled into this country. His aim being to prove the Church in the wrong, to shake her authority and disparage her teaching, he selected for his attack certain English words which had acquired a theological or ecclesiastical connotation, and, avoiding these words where they were proper equivalents for the Latin, he substituted others.

Thus	Grace	became	Favour.
	Charity	,,	Love.
	Confessing	,,	Acknowledging.
	Priests	,,	Seniors.
	Idols	,,	Images.
	Salvation	,,	Health.
	Church	,,	Congregation.

So "full of grace" Luke ii. became "highly

favoured"; "On this rock I will build my Church" Matt. xviii. 17. "On this rock I will build my Congregation"; "Let him bring in the priests of the Church" Jas. v. 14. "Let him bring in the seniors of the congregation"; "Little children keep yourselves from idols" 1. John v. 21. "Babes, keep yourselves from images"; "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" II. Cor. vi. 16. "How agreeth the temple of God with images?"

Not content with this he added Prefaces and Notes conceived in a hostile and anti-Catholic spirit. As the Anglican Canon Dixon in his "History* of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction" says, speaking of the attempted suppression and destruction of Tyndale's works; "If the clergy had acted thus, simply because they would have kept the people ignorant of the Word of God they would have been without excuse. But it was not so. Every one of the little volumes containing portions of the Sacred Text that was issued by Tyndale contained also a Prologue and Notes, written with such hot fury of vituperation against the prelates and clergy, the monks and friars, the rites and ceremonies

* Oxford, Univ. Press 1895

of the Church, as, though an extensive circulation was secured to the work thereby, was hardly likely to commend it to the favour of those who were attacked." He adds: "Moreover these versions themselves were held to be hostile to the Catholic faith, as it was then understood, and to convey the sense unfaithfully or maliciously. The venerable words were ignored in them, and every variation that indicated opposition to the standing system was introduced. One of the bishops declared that he had found more than two thousand heresies in Tyndale's version. A great layman, Sir Thomas More himself, found it necessary to write a formal treatise against him, in which he exhibited a considerable number of venerable words for which Tyndale had found unauthorized and dangerous substitutes. There were, in particular, three such words which seemed the cardinal points of the Catholic system; they were, Priests, Church, and Charity. The first of these Tyndale constantly turned into Seniors; he rendered the second by Congregation; the third he gave as Love."

With regard to Tyndale's Prologues and Notes a Book of Mala Dogmata, or Declaration of faults and abuses requiring remedy; issued by the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury

in 1536, leads us to search a little deeper for their root. The resemblance between them and the heresies of the Valdenses in the 12th century is so striking that there can be little doubt that those heresies, conveyed through Wycliffe,* were the source of Tyndale's notes. These heresies also were accompanied by a translation of portions of the Bible into the vulgar tongue by one Peter Valdo, a merchant of Lyons, whose mind had become unhinged by a sudden shock. They have been classed under three heads, which, to any-one acquainted with English Protestantism will display features familiar at the present day. 1. *Errors against the Church.* That the Church of Rome was not the Church of Christ but the Harlot mentioned in the Apocalypse. That it did not hold the true Gospel and that the Pope was the author of all errors. 2. *Against the Sacraments.* That Confirmation and Extreme Unction were not Sacraments. A variety of errors against the Holy Eucharist. That a bad priest could not absolve from sin but that a good layman could. That all laymen were entitled to preach, and women also. That whatsoever was not in the Scriptures was

* Died and buried at Lutterworth 31st Dec., 1384. Exhumed and burnt 1428 by order of Council of Constance, Sess. viii. 4th May, 1415.

fabulous, That there were no Saints but the Apostles. 3. *Against Sacramentals.* A clean sweep of festivals, fast days, holy water, lights, vestments, incense, images and chanting.

Of the English analogues, or Mala Dogmata, I will quote only four, but they are sufficient to identify the whole series as what we now know as Protestantism. 1. That it was sufficient to confess to God only. 2. That Saints were not to be invoked or honoured. 3. That there was no Purgatory, and that Masses and prayers for the souls of the departed were vain and of no profit. 4. That it was lawful to eat flesh on fast days as at other times.

I think I have now shown that Protestantism is but Valdensianism revived. That William Tyndale was principally responsible for its introduction into England. That the chief instrument in its dissemination was a vernacular Bible. And, I may add, that to a vernacular Bible it owes its prolonged existence, as the Revisers of 1881 shall show us. They go on to add: "The Versions that followed were either substantially reproductions of Tyndale's translation in its final shape, or revisions of Versions that had been themselves almost entirely based on it. Three successive stages may be recognized in this continuous work of authoritative revision;

first the publication of the Great Bible of 1539—41 in the reign of Henry VIII.; next the publication of the Bishops' Bible of 1568 and 1572 in the reign of Elizabeth; and lastly the publication of the King's Bible of 1611 in the reign of James I. Besides these the Genevan version of 1560, itself founded on Tyndale's translation, must here be named; which, though not put forth by authority, was widely circulated in the country and largely used by King James's translators. Thus the form in which the English New Testament has now been read for 270 years was the result of various revisions made between 1525 and 1611; and the present Revision is an attempt, after a long interval, to follow the example set by a succession of honoured predecessors."

Here the ancestry is claimed, the descent established, the pedigree recorded. For nearly four hundred years the religious life of England has lain under the shadow of the great Bible Superstition. And what has been the result? Wars and tumults, quarrels and dissensions, factions and sects; a people divided against itself.

There are between two and three hundred discordant sects in England who all appeal to the Bible in support of their tenets. In

1701 Defoe wrote of "The true-born Englishman."

> 'In their religion they are so uneven
> That each man goes his own by-way to heaven;
> Tenacious of mistakes to that degree
> That every man pursues it separately,
> And fancies none can find the Way but he.'

The Bible instead of being a bond of peace has proved an apple of discord. Why did the version of Tyndale, continued in those of his successors, have that effect? Because those versions were never approved by the Church, were taken out of the custody of the Church, and were designed, not to confirm but to confound and overthrow the ancient English faith. To this result errors of translation contributed, but the defiant habit has so grown that the Protestant Bible-wielder of to-day could probably prove his theses just as much to his own satisfaction out of the Douai version as the Authorised. Once establish the principle that a Book is the only arbiter and that all who can read English, without reference to history, tradition, or authority, are teachers, and Christianity is gone. Christianity consists in the indissoluble union between the Church and the Scriptures; the Church their custodian

and interpreter, and the Bible the wisdom of God illuminating the Church. The Scriptures give light, certainly, but only when kindled by the Church. The wick and the oil are materials of light, but it is the flame which makes them light-giving. So the words of Scripture are the wick and oil, but it is the Church which by expounding them draws from them the light of Christian doctrine. They are as the lantern of a lighthouse built on a rock in the sea. There, in the care of the appointed keepers, it gives salutary light, and the mariner may safely shape his course by it. But remove it elsewhere or place it in inexperienced hands, and shipwreck will be the result.

Having regard to the inexorable facts of history and to the place and atmosphere in which any experiment must be tried, I greatly question whether the spiritual needs of England require or can be met by any new counter-version, however correct and approved. If it were possible to withdraw all others something might be said for it. But this is impossible. The Church in England has no influence with the State, and the Authorised Version would appeal to the State, not as a religious document, but as a storehouse of literary English. Indeed it may be truly said that it has supplied the people

with quite as much phraseology as religion.

I look with much more hope to increased reliance on Apostolic methods, not printing the Word but preaching it. Faith cometh by hearing. In spite of, or perhaps because of, the enormous output of the printing-press Englishmen are still very susceptible to speeches. And we must never forget that the Word of God was spoken before it was written, and that it is to a living voice to-day that the Church owes its vitality. Moreover the written Word of God is not plain to everyone. If the great Apostle St. Paul, trained in the prophecies and with an eye purged by sanctity had to confess "We see now in* a glass obscurely. Now I know in part but then I shall know even as I am known"; if he had to confess that the mysteries of the faith were not clear to him, that there were still riddles he could not read, of what use is the insight of the average layman? It is wiser for him to be a pupil. The Scriptures are like very precious ointment of spikenard, which when poured from the broken box on the feet of the Lord, that is on His humblest

* I. Cor. xiii. 12. δι' ἐσόπτρου By means of a mirror (with back to the object) contrasted with πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον. Cf. Plat. Rep. vii. 514.

disciple fills the whole house with the odour of the ointment. They are like wheat, of which when ground into flour, is made bread for the food of the faithful. They serve us best, not in themselves, but in the sermons, homilies, meditations, and instructions of the Saints and the Ecclesia docens. So from the pulpit, the platform and the street England may yet again be leavened with Catholic ideas. For that is what is wanted. The idea will provide proofs but proofs will not provide the idea. The hungry mind will find its own food. We have this encouragement, that, through the quiet force of the example of the last sixty years, Catholic ideas which were then in the air, are descending as angels of God from the ladder which is set up to heaven and silently folding their ranks around us. And these are helped not only by direct preaching and instruction, but by public acts of faith, by processions and pilgrimages, by the public services of the Church, by the unobtrusive example of a Catholic life. And when the variegated spectra of heresies shall have faded before the white light of a full-orbed Christianity and a Catholic appetite shall have been stimulated among Englishmen at large, they will be satisfied with no false or mutilated version but will call for and may be

trusted with the truest and most accurate that scholarship and piety can supply.

c 50 f 8 5

A. E. Treen, Printer, Rugby.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL
APR 15 1985

3 1158 00981 8765